This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY
AH 6DRU H
HARVARD DEPOSITORY
BRITTLE BOOK

Vers. 750
506.14 Lightfoot 1872

LIBRARY

OF THE

Divinity School.

RECEIVED NOV. 1884,
FROM THE LIBRARY OF EZRA ABBOT,
LATE PROFESSOR IN THE SCHOOL.

Digitized by Google

From the Author.

Digitized by Google

Ezra Abbot

From the Author.

ON

A FRESH REVISION

OF THE

ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT.

Digitized by Google

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

Digitized by Google

ON

A FRESH REVISION

OF THE

ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT

BY

Joseph Barber

J. B. LIGHTFOOT D.D.

CANON OF ST PAUL'S;

AND

HULSEAN PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, CAMBRIDGE

SECOND EDITION. 1st ed. 1871.

London and New York:

MACMILLAN AND CO.

1872.

[*All Rights reserved.*]

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

DURING the last summer, immediately before the Company appointed for the Revision of the English New Testament held its first sitting, I was invited to read a paper on the subject before a Clerical meeting. Finding that I had already written more than I could venture to read even to a very patient and considerate audience, and receiving a request from my hearers at the conclusion that the paper should be printed, I determined to revise the whole and make additions to it before publication. The result is the present volume. Owing to various interruptions its appearance has been delayed much longer than I had anticipated.

This statement of facts was perhaps needed to justify the appearance of a book, which as occupying well-known ground cannot urge the plea of novelty, which has many imperfections in form, and which

Digitized by Google

makes no pretensions to completeness. At all events it appeared necessary to be thus explicit, in order to show that I alone am responsible for any expressions of opinion contained in this volume, and that they do not (except accidentally) represent the views of the Company of which I am a member. In preparing the original paper for the press, I have been careful not to go beyond verbal alterations, where I was discussing the prospects of the new Revision or the principles which in my opinion ought to guide it. On the other hand, I have not scrupled to develope these principles freely, and to add fresh illustrations from time to time: but in most cases this has been done without any knowledge of the opinion of the majority of the Company; and in the comparatively few instances where this opinion has become known to me, I have expressed my own individual judgment, which might or might not accord therewith.

I ought to add also that I am quite prepared to find on consultation with others, that some of the suggestions offered here are open to objections which I had overlooked, and which might render them impracticable in a Version intended for popular use, whatever value they may have from a scholar's point of view.

The hopeful anticipations, which I had ventured to express before the commencement of the work, have been more than realized hitherto in its progress. On this point I have not heard a dissentient voice among members of the Company. I believe that all

Digitized by Google

who have taken part regularly in the work will thankfully acknowledge the earnestness, moderation, truthfulness, and reverence, which have marked the deliberations of the Company, and which seem to justify the most sanguine auguries.

This feeling contrasts strangely with the outcry which has been raised against the work by those who have had no opportunity of witnessing its actual progress, who have been disturbed by rumours of its results either wholly false or only partially true, and who necessarily judging on *a priori* grounds have been ready to condemn it unheard. This panic was perhaps not unnatural, and might have been anticipated. Meanwhile however other dangers from an unforeseen quarter have threatened the progress of the Revision; but these are now happily averted. And, so far as present appearances can be trusted, the momentary peril has resulted in permanent good; for the Company has been taught by the danger which threatened it to feel its own strength and coherence; and there is every prospect that the work will be brought happily and successfully to a conclusion.

Great misunderstanding seems to prevail as to the ultimate reception of the work. The alarm which has been expressed in some quarters can only be explained by a vague confusion of thought, as though the Houses of Convocation, while solemnly pledged to the furtherance of the work on definite conditions, were also pledged to its ultimate recep-

Digitized by Google

tion whether good or bad. If the distinction had been kept in view, it is difficult to believe that there would have been even a momentary desire to repudiate the obligations of a definite contract. The Houses of Convocation are as free, as the different bodies of Nonconformists represented in the Companies, to reject the Revised Version, when it appears, if it is not satisfactory. I do not suppose that any member of either Company would think of claiming any other consideration for the work, when completed, than that it shall be judged by its intrinsic merits; but on the other hand they have a right to demand that it shall be laid before the Church and the people of England in its integrity, and that a verdict shall be pronounced upon it as a whole.

I cannot close these remarks without expressing my deep thankfulness that I have been allowed to take part in this work of Revision. I have spent many happy and profitable hours over it, and made many friends who otherwise would probably have remained unknown to me. Even though the work should be terminated abruptly to-morrow, I for one should not consider it lost labour.

In choosing my examples I have generally avoided dwelling on passages which have been fully discussed by others; but it was not possible to put the case fairly before the public without venturing from time to time on preoccupied ground, though in such instances I have endeavoured to tread as lightly as possible.

Digitized by Google

The discussion in the Appendix perhaps needs some apology. Though it has apparently no very direct bearing on the main subject of the volume, yet the investigation was undertaken in the first instance with a view to my work as a reviser; and hoping that the results might contribute towards permanently fixing the meaning of an expression, which occurs in the most familiar and most sacred of all forms of words, and which nevertheless has been and still is variously interpreted, I gladly seized this opportunity of placing them on record.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,
April 3, 1871.

THIS second edition is in all essential respects a reprint of the first. A few errors have been corrected, and one or two unimportant additions made, but the new matter altogether would not occupy more than a page.

The reception accorded to this book has taken me by surprise, and the early call for a new edition would have prevented me from making any great changes, even if I had felt any desire to do so. To my critics, whether public or private, I can only return my very sincere thanks for their generous welcome of a work of whose imperfections the author himself must be only too conscious.

From this expression of gratitude I see no reason to

Digitized by Google

except the critique of Mr Earle in a letter addressed to the editor of the *Guardian;* but I am sure that he will pardon me if, while thankfully acknowledging the friendly tone of his letter, I venture entirely to dissent from a principle of translation to which he has lent the authority of his name.

In fact he has attacked the very position in my work, which I confidently held, and still hold, to be impregnable. I had laid it down as a rule (subject of course to special exceptions) that, where the same word occurs in the same context in the original, it should be rendered by the same equivalent in the Version (p. 33 sq.); or, as Mr Earle expresses it, that 'a verbal repetition in English should be employed to represent a verbal repetition in the Greek.' Mr Earle (I will employ his own words) would reverse this, and say that in many of my details he would practically come to my conclusion, but that the principle itself, with all the speciousness of its appearance, is essentially unsound. This position he endeavours to establish by arguments, which I feel bound to meet, for I consider the principle which he assails to be essential to a thoroughly good translation.

If, notwithstanding our opposite points of view, we had arrived at the same results, or, in other words, if Mr Earle's exceptions to his principle of variety were coextensive or nearly coextensive with my own applications of my principle of uniformity, I should have felt any discussion of his views to be superfluous; for then, so far as regards any practical issues, the difference between us would have been reduced to a mere battle of words. But when I find that Mr Earle defends such a rendering as Matt. xviii. 33, 'Shouldest not thou also have had *compassion* (ἐλεῆσαι) on thy fellow-servant, even as I had *pity* (ἠλέησα) on thee?', I feel that the difference between us is irreconcilable. Indeed I had vainly thought that my illustrations (with one or two doubtful exceptions) would carry conviction in themselves; and I confess myself

Digitized by Google

a little surprised to find their cogency questioned by an English scholar of Mr Earle's eminence.

But, lest I should be misunderstood, let me say at the outset that I entirely agree with Mr Earle in deprecating the mode of procedure which would substitute 'the fidelity of a lexicon' for 'the faithfulness of a translation.' I am well aware that this is a real danger to careful minds trained in habits of minute verbal criticism, and I always have raised and shall raise my voice against any changes which propose to sacrifice forcible English idiom to exact conformity of expression. For instance, it would be mere pedantry to substitute 'Do not ye rather excel them?' for 'Are not ye much better than they?' in Matt. vi. 26 (οὐχ ὑμεῖς μᾶλλον διαφέρετε αὐτῶν); or 'The hour hath approached,' for 'The hour is at hand,' in Matt. xxvi. 45 (ἤγγικεν ἡ ὥρα). But the point at issue seems to me to be wholly different. I cannot for a moment regard this as a question of English idiom; and my objection to the variety of rendering which Mr Earle advocates is that it does depart from 'the faithfulness of a translation' and substitutes, not indeed the fidelity of a lexicon, but the caprice of a translator.

Mr Earle says 'The stronghold of the Greek (I do not speak of Plato and Demosthenes, but of the New Testament) is in the words: the stronghold of the English language is in its phraseology and variability.' This is not the distinction which I should myself give between the characteristics of the two languages. Even in its later stages the wealth of particles, the power of inflexion and composition, and the manifold possibilities of order, still constitute the peculiar superiority of the Greek over the English. But it matters little whether I am right or wrong here, for the objections to Mr Earle's practical inferences are equally strong in either case. He first of all alleges examples where synonyms are coupled in English, and more especially

Digitized by Google

in rendering from another language, as for instance in Chaucer's translation of Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiæ*, where *claritudo* is rendered 'renoun and clernesse of linage,' and *censor* 'domesman or juge'; and he then urges that as this method of double rendering was 'manifestly inadmissible in translating scripture,' 'the translators fell upon a device by which they allowed some play to the natural bent of the English language; and where a Greek word occurs repeatedly in a context, they rather leaned to a variation of the rendering.'

Now it is one thing to give a double rendering to a single word at any one occurrence; and another to give it two different renderings at two different occurrences in the same context. The two principles have nothing in common. In the former case the translation will at the worst be clumsy; in the latter it must in many cases be absolutely misleading. For by splitting up the sense of the word and giving one half to one part of the sentence and the remaining half to the other, a disconnexion, perhaps even a contrast, is introduced, which has no place in the original. If therefore the English on any occasion furnishes no exact and coextensive equivalent for a given Greek word as used in a given context (and this difficulty must occur again and again in translation from any language to another), it will generally be the less evil of the two to select the word which comes nearest in meaning to the original and to retain this throughout.

But the examples of capricious varieties which I had chosen to illustrate this vicious principle of translation, and which Mr Earle is prepared to defend, cannot in most cases plead this justification, that a single English word does not adequately represent the Greek. It would require far more minute scholarship than I possess to discern any difference in meaning between *υἱὸς* and 'son.' Yet Mr Earle stands

Digitized by Google

forward as the champion of the rendering in Matt. xx. 20, 'Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's *children* (υἱῶν) with her *sons* (υἱῶν).' The particular rendering is comparatively unimportant in itself; but as illustrating the capricious license of our translators it is highly significant. It introduces a variety for no reason at all: and this variety is incorrect in itself; for 'the mother of Zebedee's children' is a wider expression than 'the mother of Zebedee's sons,' by which the Evangelist intends only to describe her as the mother of James and John with whom the narrative is concerned, and which neither implies nor suggests the existence of other brothers and sisters.

Again, Mr Earle is satisfied and more than satisfied with the rendering of Matt. xviii. 33, 'Shouldest not thou also have had *compassion* (ἐλεῆσαι) on thy fellow-servant, even as I had *pity* (ἠλέησα) on thee?' 'If,' he asks, 'we compare our "compassion—pity" with the one Greek word, what loss is there in the variation? Is there not a gain in breadth?' I answer, a very serious loss; and I do not allow that breadth (or, as I prefer to call it, looseness) is any gain, where exact correspondence in the two clauses is essential to the main idea of the passage. What would be said, if I were to suggest such translations as 'Blessed are the *pitiful* (ἐλεήμονες), for they shall obtain *mercy* (ἐλεηθήσονται)' in Matt. v. 7, or 'If ye *forgive* (ἀφῆτε) not men their *trespasses* (παραπτώματα), neither will your heavenly Father *remit* (ἀφήσει) your *transgressions* (παραπτώματα)' in Matt. vi. 15, or 'Be ye therefore *faultless* (τέλειοι) as your Father which is in heaven is *perfect* (τέλειος)' in Matt. v. 48? I do not doubt that if these passages had been so translated in our Authorised Version, the variations would have found admirers: but, as it is, who will question the vast superiority of the existing renderings, where the repetition of the English word corresponds to the repeti-

Digitized by Google

tion of the Greek? In all these passages the thought is one and the same; that the ideal of human conduct is the exact copying of the Divine. In the other examples quoted our translators have preserved this thought unimpaired by repeating the same word, but in Matt. xviii. 33 it is marred by the double rendering 'compassion, pity': while the idea of '*fellow*-feeling', which is implied in 'compassion' and in which the chief fault lies, has no place in the original ἐλεεῖν.

Again, Mr Earle defends the double rendering of διαιρέσεις in 1 Cor. xii. 4, 'There are *diversities* of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are *differences* of administrations, but the same Lord; and there are *diversities* of operations, but it is the same God etc.,' and seems even to regret the abandonment of Tyndale's triple rendering *diversities, differences, divers manners.* What again, I ask, would be said, if I were to propose to translate 2 Cor. xi. 26 'In perils of waters, in dangers from robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in dangers from the heathen, in hazards in the city, in hazards in the wilderness, etc.,' thus gaining breadth by varying the rendering of κινδύνοις? Happily conservative feeling in this instance is enlisted on the right side, and it may be presumed that no change will be desired. But, so far as I can see, the two cases are exactly analogous; the effect of the sentence in each case depending on the maintenance of the same word, which arrests the ear and produces its effect by repetition, like the tolling of a bell or the stroke on an anvil. Indeed I must conclude that my mind is differently constituted from Mr Earle's, when I find him defending the translation of James ii. 2, 3 'If there come unto your assembly a man with a gold ring in *goodly apparel* (ἐν ἐσθῆτι λαμπρᾷ) and there come in also a poor man in vile *raiment* (ἐσθῆτι), and ye have respect unto him that weareth the *gay clothing* (τὴν ἐσθῆτα

Digitized by Google

τὴν λαμπράν) etc.' Not only do I regard the variation here as highly artificial (a sufficient condemnation in itself), but it seems to me to *dissipate* the force of the passage, and therefore I am prepared to submit to the 'cruel impoverishment' by which the English would be made to conform to the simplicity of the Greek. Nor again am I able to see why, in Rev. xvii. 6 ἐθαύμασα θαῦμα μέγα, '1 *wondered* with great *admiration*' is to be preferred to the natural rendering 'I *wondered* with great *wonder*,' as in 1 Thess. iii. 9 ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ χαρᾷ ᾗ χαίρομεν δι' ὑμᾶς is translated 'for all the *joy* wherewith we *joy* for your sakes', and not 'for all the *gladness*.' In this passage from the Revelation the words immediately following (ver. 7) run in the English Version, 'And the angel said unto me, Wherefore didst thou *marvel* (ἐθαύμασας)?', where by the introduction of a third rendering a still further injury is inflicted on the compactness of the passage.

So far with regard to the sense. But Mr Earle urges that the sound must be consulted; that the ear, for instance, requires the variations *compassion*, *pity*, in Matt. xviii. 33, and *wonder*, *admiration* (he omits to notice *marvel*) in Rev. xvii. 6, 7; that generally there is this 'broad modulatory distinction between the ancient tongues and the great modern languages of Western Europe that the former could tolerate reverberation to a degree which is intolerable to the latter'; and that 'perhaps there is not one of them that is more sensitive in this respect than the English.'

In reply to this, I will ask my readers whether there is anything unpleasant to the ear in the frequent repetition of 'perils' in the passage already quoted, 2 Cor. xi. 26, or of 'blessed' in the beatitudes, Matt. v. 3—11. But this last reference suggests an application of the experimental test on a larger scale. I should find it difficult (and I venture to hope that Mr Earle will agree with me here) to point to

Digitized by Google

any three continuous chapters in the New Testament, which are at once so vigorously and faithfully rendered, and in which the rhythm and sound so entirely satisfy the ear, as those which make up the Sermon on the Mount. Indeed this portion of our Authorised Version deserves to be regarded as a very model of successful translation. What then are the facts? In the original the reverberation is sustained throughout, beginning with the beatitudes and ending with the closing parable, so that there are not many verses without an instance, while some contain two or three. Happily in our Authorised Version this characteristic is faithfully reproduced. The temptation to capricious variety to which our translators elsewhere give way is here foregone; and indeed the whole number of the repetitions in the English is slightly greater than in the Greek: for though either from inadvertence or from the exigencies of translation one is dropped here and there (*e.g.* λάμπει, λαμψάτω, *giveth light, shine*, v. 15, 16; *bring, offer*, προσφέρῃς, πρόσφερε, v. 23, 24; ἀπολύσῃ, ἀπολελυμένην, *put away, divorced*, v. 31, 32; ἐπιορκήσεις, ὅρκους, *forswear, oaths*, v. 33; ἀφανίζουσι, φανῶσι, *disfigure, appear*, vi. 16; θησαυρίζετε, θησαυρούς, *lay up, treasures*, vi. 19; περιεβάλετο, περιβαλώμεθα, *arrayed, clothed*, vi. 29, 31; μέτρῳ, μετρεῖτε, *measure, mete*, (?) vii. 2; ᾠκοδόμησεν, οἰκίαν, *built, house*, vii. 24) yet on the other hand the balance is more than redressed by the same rendering of different words in other parts (e. g. *light*, καίουσιν, λάμπει, φῶς, v. 14—16; *fulfil*, πληρῶσαι, γένηται, v. 17, 18; *righteousness* repeated, though δικαιοσύνη occurs only once in the original, v. 20; *whosoever*, πᾶς ὁ, ὃς ἄν, v. 22; *divorcement, divorced*, ἀποστάσιον, ἀπολελυμένην, v. 31, 32; *forswear, swear*, ἐπιορκήσεις, ὀμόσαι, v. 33, 34; *reward*, μισθόν, ἀποδώσει, vi. 2, 4, 5, 6, 16, 18; *streets*, ῥύμαις, πλατειῶν, vi. 2, 5; *day, daily*, σήμερον, ἐπιούσιον, vi. 11; *light*, λύχνος, φωτεινόν, φῶς, vi. 22, 23; *raiment, arrayed*, ἐνδύματος, περιεβάλετο, vi.

Digitized by Google

28, 29; *clothe, clothed*, ἀμφιέννυσιν, περιβαλώμεθα, vi. 30, 31; *good*, ἀγαθόν, καλούς, vii. 17, 18; *beat*, προσέπεσαν, προσέκοψαν, vii. 25, 27). If my readers are of opinion that the general method adopted by our translators in the Sermon on the Mount is faulty, and that these three chapters would have gained by greater breadth and variety, I have nothing more to say; but, if they are satisfied with this method, then they have conceded everything for which I am arguing[1].

But Mr Earle proceeds: 'There is no end to the curiosities of scholarship and the perilous minutiæ that such a principle may lead to, if it is persevered in'; and by way of illustration he adds, 'Dr Lightfoot seems to ignore what I should have regarded as an obvious fact, that it is hardly possible in modern English to make a play upon words compatible with elevation of style. It was compatible with solemnity in Hebrew and also in the Hebrew-tinctured Greek of the New Testament; but in English it is not. Explain it as you may, the fact is palpable. Does it not tax all our esteem for Shakspeare to put up with many a passage of

[1] I confess myself quite unable to follow Mr Earle's logic, when he criticises what I had said of the Rheims Version. My words are (p. 44), 'Of all the English Versions the Rhemish alone has paid attention to this point, and so far compares advantageously with the rest, to which in most other respects it is confessedly inferior.' On this he remarks; 'It is certainly unfortunate for our author's position that by his own showing the version which has kept to his principle should nevertheless be confessedly inferior in most other respects, including, as I apprehend, the highest respects that can affect our judgment of a version of Holy Scripture. To put this admission with the clearness due to its importance; the Rheims Version is the best, in that it has observed our author's principle: but as a rendering of Scripture it is the worst.' Why unfortunate? Does experience suggest that the man or the book that is right on five points out of six, must be right on the sixth point also? Does it not rather lead us to expect some element of right in the most wrong and some element of wrong in the most right?

Digitized by Google

which in any other author we should not hesitate to say that it was deformed and debased by a jingle of word-sounds?'

To this I answer fearlessly that I certainly do desire to see the play of words retained in the English Version, wherever it can be done without forcing the English. I believe that our translators acted rightly when they rendered χρώμενοι, καταχρώμενοι, by *use, abuse* in 1 Cor. vii. 31; I believe that they were only wrong in translating κατατομή, περιτομή, *concision, circumcision*, in Phil. iii. 2, 3, because the former is hardly a recognised English word and would not be generally understood. I freely confess that in many cases, perhaps in most cases, the thing cannot be done; but I am sorry for it[1]. I cannot for a moment acquiesce in Mr Earle's opinion, that it is incompatible with 'solemnity,'

[1] On my suggestion that in 2 Thess. iii. 11 the play on ἐργαζομένους, περιεργαζομένους, might be preserved by the words *business, busy-bodies*, Mr Earle remarks; 'As a matter of history the word *business* has no radical connection with *busy*: it is merely a disguised form of the French *besognes*. This is however a secondary matter, because if the word-play be desirable as a matter of English taste, these words would answer the purpose just as well as if their affinity were quite established.' Without hazarding any opinion on a question on which Mr Earle is so much more competent to speak than myself, I would venture to remark: (1) That the direct derivation of *business* from *busy* is maintained by no less an authority than Jacob Grimm, *Deutsche Grammatik*, II. p. 237 sq.; (2) That other authorities maintain (whether rightly or wrongly I do not venture to say) the radical connexion of the Teutonic words *busy* (Engl.), *besig* (Dutch), with the Romance words *besogne, bisogna*; and (3) That this very play of words occurs in the earliest English translations of the Scriptures, the Wycliffite Versions, in 1 Cor. vii. 32, 'I wole you for to be withoute *bisynesse* (ἀμερίμνους, Vulg. *sine sollicitudine*). Sothli he that is withoute wyf is *bysy* (μεριμνᾷ, Vulg. *sollicitus est*) what thingis ben of the Lord.'

Mr Earle remarks that in 2 Thess. iii. 11 'Even the Rheims Version keeps clear of this (the play of words): it has "working nothing, but curiously meddling."' The fact is that after its wont it has translated

Digitized by Google

with 'elevation of style.' Above all I repudiate the notion, which seems to underlie whole paragraphs of Mr Earle's critique, that it is the business of a translator, when he is dealing with the Bible, to *improve* the style of his author, having before my eyes the warning examples of the past, and believing that all such attempts will end in discomfiture[1]. Is it not one great merit of our English Version,

the Vulgate 'Nihil operantes sed curiose agentes,' in which this characteristic of the original has disappeared.

This paronomasia is not confined to St Paul but occurs also in Aristides II. p. 418 *ταῦτα εἴργασται μέν...περιείργασται δὲ μηδαμῶς*, just as the Apostle's *φρονεῖν, σωφρονεῖν* (Rom. xii. 3) has a parallel in a passage quoted by Stobæus as from Charondas *Floril.* xliv. 40 *προσποιείσθω δὲ ἕκαστος τῶν πολιτῶν σωφρονεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ φρονεῖν.*

[1] The anxiety to impart dignity to the language of the Apostles and Evangelists reaches a climax in *A Liberal Translation of the New Testament, being an attempt to translate the Sacred Writings with the same Freedom, Spirit and Elegance with which other English Translations from the Greek Classics have lately been executed:* by E. Harwood, London, 1768. In this strange production the following is a sample of St Luke's narrative (xi. 40), 'Absurd and preposterous conduct! Did not the Great Being, who made the external form, create the internal intellectual powers—and will he not be more solicitous for the purity of the mind than for the showy elegance of the body?' and this again of St John's (iii. 32), 'But though this exalted personage freely publishes and solemnly attests those heavenly doctrines, etc.' The parable of the prodigal son in the former begins (xv. 11), 'A gentleman of splendid family and opulent fortune had two sons.' Even Dr Johnson himself, the great master of grandiloquent English, could not tolerate this book. 'Returning through the house,' we are told, 'he stepped into a small study or book-room. The first book he laid his hands upon was Harwood's *Liberal Translation of the New Testament.* The passage which first caught his eye was that sublime apostrophe in St John upon the raising of Lazarus *Jesus wept*, which Harwood had conceitedly rendered *And Jesus, the Saviour of the world, burst into a flood of tears.* He contemptuously threw the book aside, exclaiming "Puppy!"' (Appendix to Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, in Croker's edition, London, 1866,

Digitized by Google

regarded as a literary work, that it has naturalised in our language the magnificent Hebraisms of the original? But the case before us is even stronger than this. The *paronomasia* is a characteristic of St Paul's style, and should be reproduced (so far as the genius of the English language permits) like any other characteristic. That it is admissible, the example of Shakespeare which Mr Earle adduces, and that of Tennyson, whose 'name and fame' he himself has already quoted and who abounds in similar examples of alliteration and assonance, not to mention other standard writers whether of the Elizabethan or of the Victorian era, are sufficient evidence. I am not concerned to defend Shakespeare's literary reputation, which may be left to itself; and I have certainly no wish to maintain that he was entirely free from the affectations of his age: but I am unfeignedly surprised to find plays on words condemned wholesale, as incompatible with elevation of style. Under certain circumstances, paronomasia, alliteration, and the like, are not only very natural, but, as indicating intensity of feeling, may produce even a tragic effect. With the appreciation of a great genius Shakespeare himself has explained and justified their use under such circumstances. When John of Gaunt, in his last illness, is visited by Richard, and in reply to the king's enquiry keeps harping on his name,

> Old Gaunt indeed and gaunt in being old,

p. 836). Johnson's biographer, Boswell, speaks of it as 'a fantastical translation of the New Testament in modern phrase' (p. 506). See also Mr Matthew Arnold's opinion (quoted below p. 189) on a very similar attempt at a revised version by Franklin. I am quite sure that Mr Earle's suffrage would be on the same side; but, when he asks that the distinctive features of the sacred writers may be sacrificed to 'elevation of style' and pleads that the language may be made more 'full-bodied' to suit 'the public taste' than it is in the original, is he not leading us, though by a different road, to the edge of the very same precipice?

Digitized by Google

the king asks,

> Can sick men play so nicely with their names?

The old man's answer is,

> No; *misery makes sport to mock itself.*

The very intensity of his grief seeks relief in this way[1].

Again, who will question the propriety of the play on words in Queen Elizabeth's outburst of anger against Gloucester after the murder of her children?

> Cousins, indeed; and by their uncle cozen'd
> Of comfort, kingdom, kindred, freedom, life.

The very fierceness of her wrath seeks expression in the iteration of the same sounds.

And in cases where no intensity of passion exists, there may be some other determining motive. Thus we find a tendency in all languages to repetition of sound, where a didactic purpose is served. Of this motive the fondness for rhyme, alliteration, and the like, in the familiar proverbs of all languages, affords ample illustration, as in *Waste not, want not, Forewarned, forearmed, Man proposes, God disposes, Compendia dispendia*, παθήματα μαθήματα. To this category we may assign St Paul's μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν, ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν (Rom. xii. 3). Indeed it would not be difficult to show that in every instance the Apostle had some reason for employing this figure, and that he did not use it as a mere rhetorical plaything. We may find ourselves unable in any individual case to reproduce the same effect in English, and thus may be forced to abandon the attempt in despair; but not the less earnestly shall we protest against the principle that the

[1] Similarly Cicero, speaking of the Sicilians playing on the name of Verres, says (*Verr.* Act. ii. 1. 46) 'etiam *ridiculi* inveniebantur *ex dolore*.'

Digitized by Google

genius of our language requires us to abstain from the attempt under any circumstances, and that a form of speech, which is natural in itself and common to all languages, must be sacrificed to some fancied ideal of an elevated style.

TRINITY COLLEGE,
St John's Day, 1871.

Digitized by Google

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE

I. S. Jerome's Revision of the Latin Bible . . . 1

II. Authorised Version of the English Bible . . 9

III. Lessons suggested by these Historical Parallels . 12

IV. Necessity for a fresh Revision of the Authorised Version 17

§ 1. False Readings 19

§ 2. Artificial distinctions created . . . 33

§ 3. Real distinctions obliterated . . . 60

§ 4. Faults of Grammar 80

§ 5. Faults of Lexicography 133

§ 6. Treatment of Proper Names, Official Titles, etc. 146

§ 7. Archaisms, Defects in the English, Errors of the Press, etc. 170

V. Prospects of the New Revision 187

Appendix on the words *ἐπιούσιος, περιούσιος* . . . 195

Indices 243

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

A FRESH REVISION

OF THE

ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT.

I.

MORE than two centuries had elapsed since the first Latin Version of the Scriptures was made, when the variations and errors of the Latin Bible began to attract the attention of students and to call for revision. It happened providentially, that at the very moment when the need was felt, the right man was forthcoming. In the first fifteen centuries of her existence the Western Church produced no Biblical scholar who could compare with S. Jerome in competence for so great a task. At the suggestion of his ecclesiastical superior, Damasus bishop of Rome, he undertook this work, for which many years of self-denying labour had eminently fitted him.

It is no part of my design to give a detailed account of this undertaking. I wish only to remark that when Jerome applied himself to his task, he foresaw that he should expose himself to violent attacks, and that this anticipation was not disappointed

Digitized by Google

by the result. 'Who,' he asks in his preface to the Gospels, the first portion of the work which he completed, 'Who, whether learned or unlearned, when he takes up the volume, and finds that what he reads differs from the flavour he has once tasted, will not immediately raise his voice and pronounce me guilty of forgery and sacrilege, for daring to add, to change, to correct anything in the ancient books[1]?'

Again and again he defends himself against his antagonists. His temper, naturally irritable, was provoked beyond measure by these undeserved attacks, and betrayed him into language which I shall not attempt to defend. Thus writing to Marcella[2] he mentions certain 'poor creatures (homunculos) who studiously calumniate him for attempting to correct some passages in the Gospels against the authority of the ancients and the opinion of the whole world.' 'I could afford to despise them,' he says, 'if I stood upon my rights, for a lyre is played in vain to an ass.' 'If they do not like the water from the purest fountain-head, let them drink of the muddy streams.' And after more to the same effect, he returns again at the close of the letter to these 'two-legged donkeys (bipedes asellos),' exclaiming, 'Let *them* read, *Rejoicing in hope, serving the time*; let *us* read, *Rejoicing in hope, serving the Lord*[3]; let *them* consider that an accusation ought under no circum-

[1] *Op.* x. 660 (ed. Vallarsi).

[2] *Epist.* 28 (I. p. 133).

[3] The reading καιρῷ for κυρίῳ, Rom. xii. 11.

Digitized by Google

stances to be received against an elder; let *us* read, *Against an elder receive not an accusation but before two or three witnesses; them that sin rebuke*[1]. Let *them* be satisfied with, *It is a human saying, and worthy of all acceptation:* let *us* err with the Greeks, that is with the Apostle who spoke in Greek, *It is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation*[2].' And elsewhere, referring to these same detractors, he writes with a severity which was not undeserved; 'Let them read first and despise afterward, lest they appear to condemn works of which they know nothing, not from deliberate judgment, but from the prejudice of hatred[3].' 'Thus much I say in reply to my traducers, who snap at me like dogs, maligning me in public and reading me in a corner, at once my accusers and my defenders, seeing that they approve in others what they disapprove in me[4].'

If these attacks had been confined to personal enemies like Rufinus[5], who were only retaliating upon Jerome the harsh treatment which they had received at his hands, his complaints would not have excited much sympathy. But even friends looked coldly or suspiciously on his noble work. His admirer, the great Augustine himself, wrote to deprecate an under-

[1] The omission of the clause *εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων*, 1 Tim. v. 19.

[2] The reading *ἀνθρώπινος* for *πιστός*, 1 Tim. iii. 1.

[3] *Op.* IX. 684. [4] *Op.* IX. 1408.

[5] See Hieron. *Op.* II. 660, where Rufinus exclaims, 'Istud commissum dic quomodo emendabitur? immo, nefas quomodo expiabitur?' with more to the same effect.

Digitized by Google

taking which might be followed by such serious results. He illustrated his fears by reference to the well-known incident to which Jerome's version of the Book of Jonah had given occasion, as a sample of the consequences that might be expected to ensue. A certain bishop had nearly lost his flock by venturing to substitute Jerome's rendering 'hedera' for 'cucurbita,' and could only win them back again by reinstating the old version which he had abandoned. They would not tolerate a change in an expression 'which had been fixed by time in the feelings and memory of all and had been repeated through so many ages in succession[1].'

Of the changes which Jerome introduced into the text of the New Testament, the passage quoted above affords sufficient illustration. In the Old Testament a more arduous task awaited him. The Latin Version which his labours were destined to supersede had been made from the Septuagint. He himself undertook to revise the text in conformity with the original Hebrew. It will appear strange to our own age that this was the chief ground of accusation against him. All the Greek and Latin Churches, it was urged, had hitherto used one and the same Bible; but this bond of union would be dissolved by a new version made from a different text. Thus the utmost confusion would ensue. Moreover, what injury might not be done to the faith of the weaker brethren by casting doubt on the state

[1] Hieron. *Epist.* 104 (I. 636 sq.).

Digitized by Google

of the sacred text? What wounds might not be inflicted on the pious sentiments of the believer by laying sacrilegious hands on language hallowed by long time and association?

But, independently of the dangerous consequences which might be expected, no words were too strong to condemn the arrogance and presumption of one who thus ventured to set aside the sacred text as it had been used by all branches and in all ages of the Church from the beginning. To this cruel taunt Jerome replied nobly: 'I do not condemn, I do not blame the Seventy, but I confidently prefer the Apostles to them all[1].' 'I beseech you, reader, do not regard my labours as throwing blame on the ancients. Each man offers what he can for the tabernacle of God[2]. Some gold and silver and precious stones: others fine linen and purple and scarlet and blue: I shall hold myself happy if I have offered skins and goats' hair. And yet the Apostle considers that the more despised members are more necessary (1 Cor. xii. 22)[3].'

Moreover there was a very exaggerated estimate of the amount of change which his revision would introduce. Thus Augustine, when endeavouring to deter him, speaks of his new *translation;* Jerome in reply tacitly corrects his illustrious correspondent, and calls the work a *revision*[4]. And throughout he

[1] *Op.* IX. 6. [2] Exod. XXV. 2 sq. [3] *Op.* IX. 460.

[4] See Hieron. *Epist.* 104, I. 637, for Augustine's letter ('Evangelium ex Græco interpretatus es'), and *Epist.* 112, I. 753, for Jerome's reply ('in Novi Testamenti emendatione'). See Dr Westcott in *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, s.v. *Vulgate*, II. p. 1696.

Digitized by Google

holds the same guarded language: he protests that he has no desire to introduce change for the mere sake of change, and that only such alterations will be made as strict fidelity to the original demands. His object is solely to place the *Hebraica veritas* before his readers in the vernacular tongue, and to this object he is stedfast.

In executing this great work, Jerome was in constant communication with Jewish rabbis, who were his Hebrew teachers and to whom he was much indebted in many ways. How great a gain this assistance was to his revision, and how largely after ages have profited by the knowledge thus brought to bear on the sacred text, I need hardly say. We may suspect (though no direct notice on this point is preserved) that with his contemporaries this fact was prominent among the counts of the indictment against him. At least it is certain that they set their faces against his substitution of the Hebrew text for the Septuagint version, on the ground that the former had been tampered with by the malignity and obduracy of the Jews. But, if this suspicion wrongs them, and they did not object to his availing himself of such extraneous aid, then they evinced greater liberality than has always been shown by the opponents of revision in later ages.

Happily Jerome felt strong in the power of truth, and could resist alike the importunity of friends and the assaults of foes. His sole object was to place before the Latin-speaking Churches the most faithful

Digitized by Google

representation of the actual words of the sacred text; and the consciousness of this great purpose nerved him with a strength beyond himself. The character of this father will not kindle any deep affection or respect. We are repelled by his coarseness and want of refinement, by his asperity of temper, by his vanity and self-assertion. We look in vain for that transparent simplicity which is the true foundation of the highest saintliness. But in this instance the nobler instincts of the biblical scholar triumphed over the baser passions of the man; and in his lifelong devotion to this one object of placing the Bible in its integrity before the Western Church, his character rises to true sublimity. 'I beseech you,' he writes, 'pour out your prayers to the Lord for me, that so long as I am in this poor body I may write something acceptable to you, useful to the Church, and worthy of after ages. Indeed I am not moved overmuch by the judgments of living men: they err on the one side or on the other, through affection or through hatred[1].' 'My voice,' he says elsewhere, 'shall never be silent, Christ helping me. Though my tongue be cut off, it shall still stammer. Let those read who will; let those who will not, reject[2].' And, inspired with a true scholar's sense of the dignity of conscientious work for its own sake irrespective of any striking results, after mentioning the pains which it has cost him to unravel the entanglement of names in the Books of Chronicles he recalls a famous word

[1] *Op.* IX. 1364. [2] *Op.* IX. 1526.

Digitized by Google

of encouragement addressed of old by Antigenidas the flute-player to his pupil Ismenias, whose skill had failed to catch the popular fancy: 'Play to me and to the Muses.' So Jerome describes his own set purpose; 'Like Ismenias I play to myself and to mine, if the ears of the rest are deaf.'[1]

Thus far I have dwelt on the opposition which Jerome encountered on all hands, and the dauntless resolution with which he accomplished his task. Let me now say a few words on the subsequent fate of his revision, for this also is an instructive page in history[2]. When completed, it received no authoritative sanction. His patron, pope Damasus, at whose instigation he had undertaken the task, was dead. The successors of Damasus showed no favour to Jerome or to his work. The Old Latin still continued to be read in churches: it was still quoted in the writings of divines. Even Augustine, who after the completion of the task seems to have overcome his misgivings and speaks in praise of Jerome's work, remains constant to the older Version. But first one writer, and then another, begins to adopt the revised translation of Jerome. Still its recognition depends on the caprice or the judgment of individual men. Even the bishops of Rome had not yet discovered that it was 'authentic.' One pope will use the Hie-

[1] *Op.* IX. 1408, 'Mihimet ipsi et meis juxta Ismeniam canens, si aures surdæ sunt ceterorum.'

[2] The history of the gradual reception of Jerome's Revision is traced in Kaulen's *Geschichte der Vulgata*, p. 190 sq. (Mainz, 1868).

Digitized by Google

ronymian Revision; a second will retain the Old Latin; while a third will use either indifferently, and a fourth will quote from the one in the Old Testament and from the other in the New[1]. As late as two centuries after Jerome's time, Gregory the Great can still write that he intends to avail himself of either indifferently, as his purpose may require, since 'the Apostolic See, over which by the grace of God he presides, uses both[2].' Thus slowly, but surely, Jerome's revision won its way, till at length, some centuries after its author's death, it drove its elder rival out of the field, and became the one recognised version of the Bible throughout the Latin Churches.

II.

I cannot forbear to call attention in passing to the close parallel which these facts present to the history of the so-called Authorised Version. This too, like Jerome's revision, was undertaken amidst many misgivings, and, when it appeared, was received with coldness or criticized with severity. When the proposal for a revision was first brought forward, 'my

[1] These statements may be verified by the quotations in Kaulen's work.

[2] Greg. Magn. *Mor. in Iob.*, Epist. ad fin. 'Novam translationem dissero; sed cum probationis causa exigit, nunc novam, nunc veterem per testimonia assumo; ut, quia sedes Apostolica cui Deo auctore præsideo utraque utitur, mei quoque labor studii ex utraque fulciatur' (*Op.* I. p. 6, Venet. 1768).

Digitized by Google

Lord of London' is reported to have said that 'if every man's humour should be followed, there would be no end of translating.' The translators themselves, when they issue their work to the public, deprecate the adverse criticism which doubtless they saw very good reason to apprehend. Such a work as theirs, they say in the opening paragraph of the preface to the reader, 'is welcomed with suspicion instead of love and with emulation instead of thanks,...and if there be any hole left for cavil to enter (and cavil, if it do not find a hole, will make one), it is sure to be misconstrued and in danger to be condemned. This will easily be granted by as many as know story or have any experience. For, was there ever anything projected, that savoured any way of newness or renewing, but the same endured many a storm of gainsaying or opposition?' and again; 'Whosoever attempteth anything for the public (especially if it pertain to religion and to the opening and clearing of the Word of God) the same setteth himself upon a stage to be glouted upon by every evil eye, yea, he casteth himself headlong upon pikes, to be gored by every sharp tongue. For he that meddleth with men's religion in any part, meddleth with their custom, nay with their freehold: and though they find no content in that which they have, yet they cannot abide to hear of altering.'

The parallel moreover extends to the circumstances of its reception. It seems now to be an established fact (so far as any fact in history which involves a com-

Digitized by Google

prehensive negative can be regarded as established) that the Revised Version never received any final authorisation either from the ecclesiastical or from the civil powers: that it was not sanctioned either by the Houses of Parliament, or by the Houses of Convocation, or by the King in Council. The Bishops' Bible still continued to be read in churches; the Geneva Bible was still the familiar volume of the fireside and the closet[1]. Several years after the appearance of the Revised Version, Bishop Andrewes, though himself one of the revisers, still continues to quote from an older Bible. Yet notwithstanding all adverse circumstances it overpowered both its rivals by the force of superior merit. It was found to be, as one had said long before of Jerome's revision, 'et verborum tenacior et perspicuitate sententiæ clarior[2]'; and this was the secret of its success. 'Thus,' writes Dr Westcott, 'at the very time when the monarchy and the Church were, as it seemed, finally overthrown, the English people by their silent and unanimous acceptance of

[1] The printing of the Bishops' Bible was stopped as soon as the new revision was determined upon. The last edition of the former was published in 1606. The Revised Version states on its title-page (1611) that it is 'Appointed to be read in Churches,' but we are not told by whom or how it was appointed. As the copies of the Bishops' Bible used in the Churches were worn out, they would probably be replaced by the Revised Version; but this seems to have been the only advantage which was accorded to it. On the other hand, the Geneva Bible continued to be printed by the King's Printer some years after the appearance of the Revised Version, and was still marked 'Cum privilegio Regiæ majestatis.'

[2] Isidor. Hispal. *Etym.* vi. 4; comp. *de Off. Eccl.* i. 12.

Digitized by Google

the new Bible gave a spontaneous testimony to the principles of order and catholicity of which both were an embodiment.' 'A revision, which embodied the ripe fruit of nearly a century of labour and appealed to the religious instinct of a great Christian people, gained by its own internal character a vital authority which could never have been secured by any edict of sovereign rulers[1].'

But the parallel may be carried a step further. In both these cases alike, as we have seen, God's law of progressive improvement, which in animal and vegetable life has been called the principle of natural selection, was vindicated here, so that the inferior gradually disappeared before the superior in the same kind: but in both cases also the remnants of an earlier Bible held and still hold their ground, as a testimony to the past. As in parts of the Latin Service-books the Vulgate has not even yet displaced the Old Latin, which is still retained either in its pristine or in its partially amended form; so also in our own Book of Common Prayer an older Version still maintains its place in the Psalter and in the occasional sentences, as if to keep before our eyes the progressive history of our English Bible.

III.

All history is a type, a parable. The hopes and the misgivings, the failures and the successes, of the

[1] *History of the English Bible*, pp. 158, 160.

Digitized by Google

past reproduce themselves in the present; and it appeared to me that at this crisis, when a revision of our English Bible is imminent, we might with advantage study the history of that revised translation, which alone among Biblical Versions can bear comparison with our own in its circulation and influence.

And, first of all, in the gloomy forebodings which have ushered in this scheme for a new revision, we seem to hear the very echo of those warning voices, which happily fell dead on the ear of the resolute Jerome. The alarming consequences, which some anticipate from any attempt to meddle with our time-honoured Version, have their exact counterpart in the apprehensions by which his contemporaries sought to deter him. The danger of estranging diverse Churches and congregations at present united in the acceptance of a common Bible, and the danger of perplexing the faith of individual believers by suggesting to them variations of text and uncertainties of interpretation—these are now, as they were then, the twin perils by which it is sought to scare the advocates of revision.

Moreover there is the like exaggerated estimate of the amount of change which any body of revisers would probably introduce. To this we can only give the same answer as Jerome. Not translation, but revision, is the object of all who have promoted this new movement. There is no intention of snapping the thread of history by the introduction of a new

Digitized by Google

version. Our English Bible owes its unrivalled merits to the principle of revision; and this principle it is proposed once more to invoke. 'To whom ever' say the authors of our Received Version, 'was it imputed for a failing (by such as were wise) to go over that which he had done and to amend it where he saw cause?' 'Truly, good Christian reader, we never thought from the beginning that we should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make a bad one a good one...but to make a good one better...that hath been our endeavour, that our mark.'

Nor again will the eminence of antagonists deter the promoters of this movement, if they feel that they have truth on their side. Augustine was a greater theologian, as well as a better man, than Jerome. But in this matter he was treading on alien ground: he had not earned the right to speak. On the other hand, a life-long devotion to the study of the Biblical text in the original languages had filled Jerome with the sense alike of the importance of the work and of the responsibility of his position. He could not be deterred by the fears of any adversaries, however good and however able. He felt the iron hand of a strong necessity laid upon him, and he could not choose but open out to others the stores of Scriptural wealth which he himself had been permitted to amass.

And again, we may take courage from the results which followed from his design, dauntlessly and persistently carried out. None of the perilous consequences, which friend and foe alike had foreboded,

Digitized by Google

did really ensue. There was indeed a long interval of transition, during which the rival versions contended for supremacy; but no weakening of individual faith, no alienation of Churches, can be traced to this source. The great schism of the Church, the severance of East and West, was due to human passion and prejudice, to fraud and self-will and ambition. History does not mention any relaxation of the bonds of union as the consequence of Jerome's work. On the contrary, the Vulgate has been a tower of strength to the Latin Churches, as Jerome foresaw that it would be. He laboured for conscience sake, more than content if his work proved acceptable to one or two intimate friends; he sought not the praise of men; his own generation viewed his labours with suspicion or hatred; and he has been rewarded with the universal gratitude of after ages.

Nor is it uninstructive to observe that the very point on which his contemporaries laid the greatest stress in their charges against him, has come to be regarded by ourselves as his most signal merit. To him we owe it, that in the Western Churches the Hebrew original, and not the Septuagint Version, is the basis of the people's Bible; and that a broad and indelible line has been drawn once for all between the Canon of the Old Testament as known to the Hebrew nation, and the later accretions which had gathered about it in the Greek and Latin Bibles. Thus we are reaping the fruits of his courage and fidelity. We are the proper heirs of his labours. The Articles of the

Digitized by Google

Church of England still continue to quote S. Jerome's authority for the distinction between the Canonical and Apocryphal books, which the council of Trent did its best to obscure.

But there is yet another lesson to be learned from the history of Jerome's revision. The circumstances of its reception are full of instruction and encouragement. It owed nothing as we have seen, to official sanction; it won its way by sterling merit. Now let us suppose that the revision, which we are about to undertake, is successfully accomplished. How are we to deal with it? If the work commends itself at once to all or to a large majority as superior to the present Version, then let it by all means be substituted by some formal authorisation. But this is quite too much to expect. Though S. Jerome's revision was incomparably better than the Old Latin, though the superiority of our received English Version to its predecessors is allowed on all hands, no such instantaneous welcome was accorded to either. They had to run the gauntlet of adverse criticism; they fought their way to acceptance inch by inch. I suppose that no one who takes part in this new revision is so sanguine as to hope that his work will be more tenderly treated. This being so, it does not seem to be necessary, and it is perhaps not even advisable, that the new Revised Version, if successfully completed, should at once authoritatively displace the old. Only let it not be prohibited. Give it a fair field, and a few years will decide the question of superiority. I do not myself

Digitized by Google

consider it a great evil, that for a time two concurrent Versions should be in use. This at least seems a simple practical solution, unless indeed there should be such an immediate convergence of opinion in favour of the revised Version, as past experience does not encourage us to expect.

IV.

But let it be granted that the spectres, which a timid apprehension calls into being, are scared away by the light of history and experience, and that the dangerous consequences of revision are shown to be imaginary; we have still to ask, whether there is sufficient reason for undertaking such a work, or (in other words) whether the defects of the existing Version are such as to call for systematic amendment? Here again we are met by the same objection, of which our translators were obliged to take notice: 'Many men's mouths,' they write, 'have been open a good while (and yet are not stopped) with speeches about the translation so long in hand...and ask what may be the reason, what the necessity of the employment: Hath the Church been deceived, say they, all this while? Hath her sweet bread been mingled with leaven, her silver with dross, her wine with water, her milk with lime?'

In addressing myself to this question, I cannot attempt to give an exhaustive answer. Materials for such an answer will be found scattered up and down

Digitized by Google

biblical commentaries and other exegetical works[1]. In Archbishop Trench's instructive volume *On the Authorized Version* of the New Testament, published a few years ago, they are gathered into a focus; and quite recently, in anticipation of the impending revision, Bishop Ellicott has stated the case concisely, giving examples of different classes of errors which call for correction. For a fuller justification of the advocates of revision I would refer to these and similar works, confining myself to a few more prominent points, in which our Version falls behind the knowledge of the age, and offering some examples in illustration of each. While doing so, I shall be led necessarily to dwell almost exclusively on the defects of our English Bible, and to ignore its merits. But I trust it will be unnecessary for me on this account to deprecate adverse criticism. No misapprehension is more serious or more unjust than the assumption that those who advocate revision are blind to the excellence of the existing Version. It is the very sense of this excellence which prompts the desire to make an admirable instrument more perfect. On the other hand, they cannot shut their eyes to the fact that the assiduous labours of scholars and divines during two centuries and a half have not been fruitless, and they are naturally anxious to pour into the treasury of the temple these accumulated gains of many generations.

[1] For the literature of the subject, see Professor Plumptre's interesting article in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, s.v. *Version, Authorized*, p. 1679.

Digitized by Google

§ 1.

And first of all let us boldly face the fact that the most important changes, in which a revision may result, will be due to the variations of reading in the Greek text. It was not the fault, it was the misfortune, of the scholars from Tyndale downward, to whom we owe our English Bible, that the only text accessible to them was faulty and corrupt. I need not take up time in recapitulating the history of the received text, which will be known to all. It is sufficient to state that all textual critics are substantially agreed on this point, though they may differ among themselves as to the exact amount of change which it will be necessary to introduce.

No doubt, when the subject of various readings is mentioned, grave apprehensions will arise in the minds of some persons. But this is just the case where more light is wanted to allay the fears which a vague imagination excites. The recent language of alarmists on this point seems incredible to those who have paid any attention to the subject. I can only state my own conviction that a study of the history and condition of the Greek text solves far more difficulties than it creates. More especially it brings out the fact of the very early and wide diffusion of the New Testament writings with a clearness and a cogency which is irresistible, and thus bears most important testimony to their genuineness and integrity. Even the variations themselves have the

Digitized by Google

highest value in this respect. Thus for instance when we find that soon after the middle of the second century divergent readings of a striking kind occur in S. John's Gospel, as for instance *μονογενὴς Θεὸς* and *ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός* (i. 18), we are led to the conclusion that the text has already a history and that the Gospel therefore cannot have been very recent. This evidential value of textual criticism moreover shows itself in other ways. I will select one instance, which has always appeared to me very instructive as illustrating the results of this study—apparently so revolutionary in its methods, and yet really so conservative in its ends.

The Epistle to the Ephesians, after having been received by churches and individuals alike (so far as we know) without a single exception from the earliest times, as the unquestioned work of the Apostle whose name it bears, has been challenged in our own generation. Now there is one formidable argument, and one only, against its genuineness. It is urged with irresistible force that S. Paul could not have written in this strain to a Church in which he had resided for some three years and with which he lived on the closest and most affectionate terms. So far as regards reference to persons or incidents, this is quite the most colourless of all S. Paul's Epistles; whereas we should expect to find it more full and definite in its allusions than any other, except perhaps the letters to Corinth. To this objection no satisfactory answer can be given without the aid of

Digitized by Google

textual criticism. But from textual criticism we learn that an intelligent and well-informed though heretical writer of the second century called it an Epistle to the Laodiceans; that in the opening verse the words 'in Ephesus' are wanting in the two oldest extant Greek MSS; that the most learned of the Greek fathers in the middle of the third century—himself a textual critic—had not the words in his copy or copies; and that another learned Greek father in the middle of the fourth century declares them to be absent from the oldest manuscripts—not to mention other subsidiary notices tending in the same direction. Putting these facts together, we get a complete answer to the objection. The Epistle is found to be a circular letter, addressed probably to the Churches of Proconsular Asia, of which Ephesus was one and Laodicea another. From Ephesus, as the metropolis, it derived its usual title, because the largest number of copies in circulation would be derived from the autograph sent thither; but here and there a copy was extant in early times addressed to some other Church (as Laodicea, for instance); and still more commonly copies existed taken from some MS in which the blank for the name of the Church had not been filled up. This circular character of the letter fully explains the absence of personal or historical allusions. Thus textual criticism in this instance removes our difficulty; but its services do not end here. It furnishes a body of circumstantial evidence which, I venture to think, must ultimately carry irresistible conviction

Digitized by Google

as to the authorship of the letter, though for the present some are found to hesitate. For these facts supplied by textual criticism connect themselves with the mention of the letter which the Colossians are charged to get from Laodicea (Col. iv. 16), and this mention again combines with the strong resemblances of matter and diction, so as to bind these two Epistles inseparably together: while again the Epistle to the Colossians is linked not less indissolubly with the letter to Philemon by the references to person and place and circumstance. Thus the three Epistles form a compact whole, to resist the assaults of adverse criticism. A striking amount of undesigned coincidence is gathered together from the most diverse quarters, converging unmistakably to one result. And the point to be observed is, that many of these coincident elements are not found in the Epistles themselves, but in the external history of the text, a circumstance which gives them a far higher evidential value. For even if it were possible to imagine a forger in an uncritical age at once able to devise a series of artifices so subtle and so complex, as on the supposition of the spuriousness of one or all of these letters we are obliged to assume, and willing to defeat his own purpose by tangling a skein which it would require the critical education of the nineteenth century to unravel; yet there would remain the still greater improbability that a man in such a position could have exercised an effective control over external circumstances—the dif-

Digitized by Google

fusion and the subsequent history of his forgeries—such as this hypothesis would suppose.

This instance will illustrate my meaning, when I alluded to the conservative action of textual criticism; for such I conceive to be its general tendency. But in fact the consideration of consequences ought not to weigh with us, in a matter where duty is so obvious. It must be our single aim to place the Bible in its integrity before the people of Christ; and, so long as we sincerely follow the truth, we can afford to leave the consequences in God's hands: and I cannot too strongly urge the truism (for truism it is) that the higher value we set on the Bible as being or as containing the Word of God, the greater (if we are faithful to our trust) will be our care to ascertain the exact expressions of the original by the aid of all the critical resources at our command. We have seen that S. Jerome's courage was chiefly tried in the substitution of a purer text, and that his fidelity herein has been recognised as his greatest claim to the gratitude of after ages. The work, which our new revisers will be required to execute, is far less revolutionary than his. Where his task required him to substitute a wholly new text in the Old Testament, they will only be required to cancel or to change a word or expression, or in rare cases a verse, here and there in the New. Where he was faithful in great things, we may trust that they will not be faithless in small.

The question therefore is not one of policy, but

Digitized by Google

of truth. Yet still it is well to face the probable results; because apprehension is especially alive on this point, and because only by boldly confronting the spectres of a vague alarm can we hope to lay them.

Let us then first of all set it down as an unmixed gain that we shall rid ourselves of an alliance which is a constant source of weakness and perplexity to us. No more serious damage can be done to a true cause, than by summoning in its defence a witness who is justly suspected or manifestly perjured. Yet this is exactly the attitude which the verse relating to the Heavenly witnesses (1 John v. 7) bears towards the great doctrine which it proclaims, so long as it retains a place in the Bible which we put into the hands of the people. Shortly after the question of revision was first mooted, an article on the subject appeared in a popular daily paper, in which the writer, taking occasion to refer to this verse, committed himself to two statements respecting it: *first*, that the passage in question had done much towards promoting the belief in the doctrine which it puts forward; and *secondly*, that the interpolator knew well what he was about and used very efficient means to gain his end. Now both these statements were evidently made in good faith by the writer and would, I suppose, be accepted as true by a very large number of his readers. But those, who have given any special attention to the subject, know that neither will bear examination. The first contradicts the plain

Digitized by Google

facts of history; the second militates against the most probable inferences of criticism. As regards the first point, it seems unquestionable that the doctrine was formally defined and firmly established some time before the interpolation appeared. A study of history shows that the Church arrived at the Catholic statement of the doctrine of the Trinity, partly because it was indicated in other passages of the New Testament (*e. g.* Matt. xxviii. 19, 2 Cor. xiii. 14), and partly because it was the only statement which, recognising the fact of the Incarnation of the Divine Word, was found at once to satisfy the instincts of a devout belief and the requirements of a true philosophy; and that the text in question had not, and could not have, anything to do with its establishment. Indeed the very fact that it is nowhere quoted by the great controversial writers of the fourth and fifth centuries has been truly regarded as the strongest evidence against its genuineness. And in more recent times, when the doctrine began to be challenged, the text was challenged also; so that at this stage the doctrine did not gain, but lose, by the advocacy of a witness whose questionable character threw discredit upon it. Again, the second statement equally breaks down when investigated. Textual criticism shows that the clause containing the Three Heavenly Witnesses was not in the first instance a deliberate forgery, but a comparatively innocent gloss, which put a directly theological interpretation on the three genuine witnesses

Digitized by Google

of S. John—the spirit and the water and the blood—a gloss which is given substantially by S. Augustine and was indicated before by Origen and Cyprian, and which first thrust itself into the text in some Latin MSS, where it betrays its origin, not only by its varieties of form, but also by the fact that it occurs sometimes before and sometimes after the mention of the three genuine witnesses which it was intended to explain. Thus both these statements alike break down, and we see no ground for placing this memorable verse in the same category with such fictions as the False Decretals, whether we regard its origin or its results; for unlike them it was not a deliberate forgery, and unlike them also it did not create a dogma. I only quote this criticism to show how much prejudice may be raised against the truth by the retention of interpolations like this; nor can we hold ourselves free from blame, if such statements are made and accepted, so long as we take no steps to eject from our Bibles an intrusive passage, against which external and internal evidence alike have pronounced a decisive verdict. In this instance our later English Bibles have retrograded from the more truthful position of the earlier. In Tyndale's, Coverdale's, and the Great Bibles the spurious words are placed in brackets and printed in a different type, and thus attention is directed to their suspicious character. In Luther's German Translation (in its original form), as also in the Zurich Latin Bible of 1543, they were omitted. In the Geneva Testament first,

Digitized by Google

so far as I am aware, and in the Bishops' Bible after it, the example was set, which the translators of our Authorised Version unhappily followed, of dispensing with these marks of doubtful genuineness and printing the passage uniformly with the context.

In other doctrinal passages where important various readings occur, the solution will not be so simple; but in doubtful cases the margin may usefully be employed. Altogether the instances in which doctrine is directly or indirectly involved are very few; and, though individual texts might be altered, the balance of doctrinal statement would probably not be disturbed by the total result, a change in one direction being compensated by a change in the other. Thus for instance, if the reading 'God was manifest in the flesh' should have to give place to 'Who was manifest in the flesh' in 1 Tim. iii. 16, and retire to the margin, yet on the other hand the 'Only-begotten God' would seem to have equal or superior claims to 'the Only-begotten Son' in John i. 18, and must either supersede it or claim a place side by side with it.

The passages, which touch Christian sentiment or history or morals, and which are affected by textual differences, though less rare than the former, are still very few. Of these the pericope of the woman taken in adultery holds the first place in importance. In this case a deference to the most ancient authorities, as well as a consideration of internal evidence, might

Digitized by Google

seem to involve immediate loss. The best solution would probably be to place the passage in brackets, for the purpose of showing, not indeed that it contains an untrue narrative (for, whencesoever it comes, it seems to bear on its face the highest credentials of authentic history), but that evidence external and internal is against its being regarded as an integral portion of the original Gospel of S. John. The close of S. Mark's Gospel should possibly be treated in the same way. If I might venture a conjecture, I should say that both the one and the other were due to that knot of early disciples who gathered about S. John in Asia Minor and must have preserved more than one true tradition of the Lord's life and of the earliest days of the Church, of which some at least had themselves been eye-witnesses[1].

Again in S. Luke's Gospel it might be right to take account of certain remarkable omissions in some texts, and probably in these cases a marginal note would be the best solution. Such for instance are the words addressed to James and John, ix. 55, 'Ye know not of what spirit ye are,' or the agony in the garden, xxii. 43, 44, or the solemn words on the Cross, xxiii. 34. It seems impossible to believe that these incidents are other than authentic; and as the text of S. Luke's Gospel is perhaps exceptional in

[1] The account of the woman taken in adultery is known to have been related by Papias, a disciple of this school, early in the second century, who also speaks of the Gospel of S. Mark. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39.

Digitized by Google

this respect (for the omissions in S. John's Gospel are of a different kind), the solution will suggest itself, that the Evangelist himself may have issued two separate editions. This conjecture will be confirmed by observing that in the second treatise of S. Luke similar traces of two editions are seen where the passages omitted in many texts, though not important in themselves (*e.g.* xxviii. 16, 29), bear equal evidence of authenticity, and are entirely free from suspicion on the ground that they were inserted to serve any purpose devotional or doctrinal.

On the other hand some passages, where the external testimony is equivocal or adverse, are open to suspicion, because the origin of or the motive for the insertions or alterations lies on the surface. Thus in S. Luke ii. 33 'His father' is altered into 'Joseph,' and ten verses later 'Joseph and his mother' is substituted for 'His parents,' evidently because the transcriber was alarmed lest the doctrine of the Incarnation might be imperilled by such language—an alarm not entertained by the Evangelist himself whose own narrative directly precluded any false inference, and who therefore could use the popular language without fear of misapprehension. And again the mention of 'fasting' in connexion with praying in not less than four passages (Matt. xvii. 21, Mark ix. 29, Acts x. 30, 1 Cor. vii. 5), in all of which it is rejected by one or more of the best editors, shows an *ascetic bias;* though indeed there is ample sanction elsewhere in the New Testament for the practice which it was thus

Digitized by Google

sought to enforce more strongly. Again allowance must be made for the influence of *liturgical usage* in such passages as the doxology to the Lord's prayer, Matt. vi. 13; and a similar explanation may be given of the insertion of the eunuch's confession of faith preparatory to baptism, Acts viii. 37. And again, when a *historical difficulty* is avoided by a various reading, this should be taken into account, as in Mark i. 1, where indeed the substitution of *ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ* for the common reading *ἐν τοῖς προφήταις* would introduce a difficulty the same in kind but less in magnitude than already exists in the received text of Matt. xxvii. 9. Or lastly, the desire to bring out the presence of a *supernatural agency* may have had its influence in procuring the insertion of the words describing the descent of the angel in John v. 3, 4. On the other hand in some cases these considerations of internal probability favour the existing text, where external evidence taken alone might lead to a different result, as in 1 Cor. xv. 51, where the received reading *πάντες οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα,* is so recommended against *πάντες κοιμηθησόμεθα, οὐ πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα.*

I believe that I have not only indicated (so far as my space allows) the really important classes of various readings, but given the most prominent illustrations in each instance. The whole number of such readings indeed is small, and only a very few remain after the examples already brought forward. On the other hand, variations of a subordinate kind

Digitized by Google

are more numerous. These occur more frequently in the Gospels than elsewhere, arising out of the attempt to supplement one Evangelical narrative by the insertion of a word or a clause from another, or to bring the one into literal conformity with the other by substitution or correction; but no considerations of moment are involved in the rectification of such passages. It is very rarely indeed that a various reading of this class rises to the interest of Matt. xix. 17 *τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ* (compared with Mark x. 18, Luke xviii. 19); and for the most part they are wholly unimportant as regards any doctrinal or practical bearing.

The same motive which operates so powerfully in the Gospels will also influence, though in a far less degree, the text of those Epistles which are closely allied to each other, as for instance the Romans and Galatians, or the Ephesians and Colossians, and will be felt moreover in isolated parallel passages elsewhere; but for the most part the corruptions in the Epistles are due to the carelessness of scribes, or to their officiousness exercised on the grammar or the style. The restoration of the best supported reading is in almost every instance a gain, either as establishing a more satisfactory connexion of sentences, or as substituting a more forcible expression for a less forcible (*e. g.* *παραβολευσάμενος* for *παραβουλευσάμενος*, Phil. ii. 30), or in other ways giving point to the expression and bringing out a better and clearer sense (*e. g.* Rom. iv. 19 *κατενόησεν*

Digitized by Google

τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα...εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐ διεκρίθη, for οὐ κατενόησεν κ. τ. λ., where the point is that Abraham *did* fully recognise his own condition and *notwithstanding* was not staggered; or 2 Cor. i. 20 ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ναὶ, διὸ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀμὴν κ. τ. λ., where ναὶ denotes the fulfilment of the promise on the part of God, and ἀμὴν the recognition and thanksgiving on the part of the Church, a distinction which is obliterated by the received reading ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ναὶ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ἀμήν; or 2 Cor. xii. 1 καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ, οὐ συμφέρον μέν, ἐλεύσομαι δὲ κ. τ. λ., where the common text καυχᾶσθαι δὴ οὐ συμφέρει μοι, ἐλεύσομαι γὰρ κ. τ. λ. is feeble in comparison). It is this very fact, that reading of the older authorities almost always exhibits some improvement in the sense (even though the change may be unimportant in itself) which gives us the strongest assurance of their trustworthiness as against the superior numbers of the more recent copies.

Altogether it may be safely affirmed that the permanent value of the new revision will depend in a great degree on the courage and fidelity with which it deals with questions of readings. If the signs of the times may be trusted, the course which is most truthful, will also be most politic. To be conservative, it will be necessary to be adequate: for no revision which fails to deal fairly with these textual problems, can be lasting. Here also the example of S. Jerome is full of encouragement.

Digitized by Google

§ 2.

From errors in the Greek text which our translators used, we may pass on to faults of actual translation. And here I will commence with one class which is not unimportant in itself, and which claims to be considered first, because the translators have dwelt at some length on the matter and attempted to justify their mode of proceeding. I refer to the various renderings of the same word or words, by which artificial distinctions are introduced in the translation, which have no place in the original. This is perhaps the only point in which they proceed deliberately on a wrong principle. 'We have not tied ourselves,' they say in the preface, 'to an uniformity of phrasing or to an identity of words.' They plead that such a course would savour 'more of curiosity than wisdom,' and they allege the quaint reason, that they might 'be charged (by scoffers) with some unequal dealing towards a great number of English words,' if they adopted one to the exclusion of another, as a rendering of the same Greek equivalent. Now, if they had restricted themselves within proper limits in the use of this liberty, no fault could have been found with this vindication. But, when the translation of the same word is capriciously varied in the same paragraph, and even in the same verse, a false

Digitized by Google

effect is inevitably produced, and the connexion will in some cases be severed, or the reader more or less seriously misled in other ways. To what extent they have thus attempted to improve upon the original by introducing variety, the following examples, though they might be multiplied many times, will suffice to show.

Why, for instance, should we read in Matt. xviii. 33 'Shouldest not thou also have had *compassion* (ἐλεῆσαι) on thy fellow servant, even as I had *pity* (ἠλέησα) on thee'; or in xx. 20 'Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's *children* (υἱῶν) with her *sons* (υἱῶν)'; or in xxv. 32 'He shall *separate* (ἀφοριεῖ) them one from another, as a shepherd *divideth* (ἀφορίζει) his sheep from the goats'? Why in S. John xvi. 1, 4, 6, should ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν be rendered in three different ways in the same paragraph; 'These things have I spoken unto you,' 'These things have I told you,' 'I have said these things unto you'; or S. Thomas be made to say, '*Put* my finger,' and '*Thrust* my hand', in the same verse, though the same Greek word βάλω stands for both (xx. 25)? Why again in the Acts (xxvi. 24, 25) should Festus cry, 'Paul, thou art *beside* thyself' (μαίνῃ, Παῦλε), and S. Paul reply, 'I am not *mad*, most noble Festus' (οὐ μαίνομαι, κράτιστε Φῆστε)? Why in the Epistle to the Romans (x. 15) should οἱ πόδες τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων εἰρήνην, τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων τὰ ἀγαθά be translated 'the feet of them that *preach the Gospel* of peace, and *bring glad tidings* of good things'? Why in the same epistle (xv. 4, 5) should

Digitized by Google

we read, 'That we through patience and *comfort* of the Scriptures (*διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γραφῶν*) should have hope,' and in the next sentence, 'Now the God of patience and *consolation* (*ὁ Θεὸς τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως*) grant you to be like minded,' though the words are identical in the two clauses, and the repetition is obviously intended by S. Paul? And why again in the salutations at the end of this epistle, as also of others, should *ἀσπάσασθε* be translated now 'salute' and now 'greet,' the two renderings being interchanged capriciously and without any law? Again in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, iii. 17, the same word *φθείρειν* is differently translated, 'If any man defile (*φθείρει*) the temple of God, him shall God destroy (*φθερεῖ*),' though the force of the passage depends on the identity of the sin and the punishment. And in a later passage (x. 16 sq.) *κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου* is translated '*partakers* of the altar,' and two verses below *κοινωνοὶ τῶν δαιμονίων* 'have *fellowship* with devils,' while (to complete the confusion) in a preceding and a succeeding verse the rendering 'be *partakers*' is assigned to *μετέχειν*, and in the same paragraph *κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος, τοῦ σώματος*, is translated '*communion* of the blood, of the body.' The exigencies of the English might demand some slight variation of rendering here, but this utter confusion is certainly not required; and yet this passage is only a sample of what occurs in numberless other places. Again in the same epistle (xii. 4 sq.) it is not easy to see why *διαιρέσεις χαρισμάτων,*

Digitized by Google

διαιρέσεις διακονιῶν, διαιρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων, are translated respectively '*diversities* of gifts,' '*differences* of administration,' '*diversities* of operations,' while in the same passage ἐνεργήματα is rendered first *operations* and then *working*. Each time I read the marvellous episode on charity in the xiiith chapter, I feel with increased force the inimitable delicacy and beauty and sublimity of the rendering, till I begin to doubt whether the English language is not a better vehicle than even the Greek for so lofty a theme; yet even here I find some blemishes of this kind. Thus in the 8th verse the same English word 'fail' is given as a rendering for both ἐκπίπτειν and καταργεῖσθαι, while conversely the same Greek word καταργεῖσθαι is translated first by *fail* and then by *vanish away*, and two verses afterwards, where it occurs again, by a third expression *be done away*. This word καταργεῖν is translated with the same latitude later on also (xv. 24, 26), 'When he shall have *put down* (καταργήσῃ) all rule and all authority and power,' and immediately afterwards, 'The last enemy that shall be *destroyed* (καταργεῖται) is death.' Let me add another instance from this epistle, for it is perhaps the most characteristic of all. In xv. 27, 28 the word ὑποτάσσειν occurs six times in the same sense within two verses; in the first three places it is rendered *put under*, in the fourth *be subdued*, in the fifth *be subject*, while in the last place the translators return again to their first rendering *put under*. Nay, even the simple word λογία when it occurs in successive verses (xvi.

Digitized by Google

1, 2) has a different rendering, first 'collection' and then 'gathering.'

The Second Epistle to the Corinthians is especially remarkable for the recurrence through whole sentences or paragraphs, of the same word or words, which thus strike the key-note to the passage. This fact is systematically disregarded by our translators who, impressed with the desire of producing what they seem to have regarded as an agreeable variety, failed to see that in such cases monotony is force. Thus in the 1st chapter the words *παρακαλεῖν, παράκλησις,* and *θλίβειν, θλίψις,* occur again and again. In the rendering of the first our translators are divided between *comfort* and *consolation,* and of the second between *tribulation, trouble,* and *affliction.* Again in the opening of the second chapter, where the tone is given to the paragraph by the frequent repetition of λύπη, λυπεῖν, we have three distinct renderings, *heaviness, sorrow, grief.* Again in the third chapter several instances of this fault occur. In the first verse this passion for variety is curiously illustrated. They render *συστατικῶν ἐπιστολῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἢ ἐξ ὑμῶν συστατικῶν* by '*Epistles* of commendation to you or *letters* of commendation from you,' where even in supplying a word (which were better left out altogether) they make a change, though in the original the adjectives refer to the same substantive. In this same chapter again they hover between *sufficient* and *able* as a rendering of *ἱκανός, ἱκανοῦν, ἱκανότης* (vv. 5, 6), while later on they interchange

Digitized by Google

abolish and *done away* for καταργεῖσθαι (vv. 7, 13, 14), and fail to preserve the connexion of ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ (ver. 18) with κάλυμμα (ver. 13 sq.) and ἀνακαλυπτόμενον (ver. 14), and of κεκαλυμμένον (iv. 3) with all three. Again in the fifth chapter ἐνδημεῖν is rendered in the same context *to be at home* and *to be present* (vv. 6, 8, 9), where the former rendering moreover in ver. 6 obscures the direct opposition to ἐκδημεῖν, this last word being rendered throughout *to be absent*; and a little later (ver. 10) τοὺς πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι κ. τ. λ. is translated 'We must all *appear* before the judgment seat of Christ,' where, independently of the fatal objection that *appear* gives a wrong sense (for the context lays stress on the *manifestation* of men's true characters at the great day), this rendering is still further faulty, as severing the connexion with what follows immediately (ver. 11), 'We are *made manifest* (πεφανερώμεθα) unto God, and I trust also are *made manifest* (πεφανερῶσθαι) in your consciences.' Again in vii. 7 *consolation* and *comfort* are once more interchanged for παρακαλεῖν, παράκλησις; in viii. 10, 11, 12, τὸ θέλειν is translated *to be forward* and *to will*, and προθυμία *readiness* and *a willing mind* in successive verses; in ix. 2, 3, 4, 5, *ready* and *prepared* are both employed in rendering παρεσκευάσται, παρεσκευασμένοι, ἀπαρασκευάστους, while conversely the single expression 'be ready' is made to represent both παρεσκεύασται and ἑτοίμην εἶναι; in x. 13, 15, 16, κανών, after being twice translated *rule*, is varied in the third passage by *line;* in xi. 16,

Digitized by Google

17, 18 the rendering of καυχᾶσθαι, καύχησις is diversified by *boast* and *glory;* and in xii. 2, 3 οὐκ οἶδα, ὁ Θεὸς οἶδεν, is twice translated 'I *cannot tell,* God *knoweth,*' while elsewhere in these same verses οἶδα is rendered 'I *knew,*' and οὐκ οἶδα, 'I *cannot tell.*' This repugnance to repeating the same word for οἶδα has a parallel in John xvi. 30, where νῦν οἴδαμεν ὅτι οἶδας πάντα is given 'Now *are we sure* that thou *knowest* all things.'

Nor is there any improvement in the later books, as the following instances, taken almost at random from a very large number which might have been adduced, will show: Phil. ii. 13 'It is God which *worketh* (ἐνεργῶν) in you, both to will and *to do* (ἐνεργεῖν)'; Phil. iii. 3 sq. 'And *have no confidence* (οὐ πεποιθότες) in the flesh; Though I might also *have confidence* (ἔχων πεποίθησιν) in the flesh; If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof *he might trust* (δοκεῖ πεποιθέναι) in the flesh, I more...*as touching* the law (κατὰ νόμον) a Pharisee; *concerning* zeal (κατὰ ζῆλος) persecuting the Church; *touching* the righteousness (κατὰ δικαιοσύνην) which is in the law, blameless': 1 Thess. ii. 4 'As we were *allowed* (δεδοκιμάσμεθα) of God...not as pleasing men but God which *trieth* (δοκιμάζοντι) our hearts': 2 Thess. i. 6 'To recompense *tribulation* to them that *trouble* you' (ἀνταποδοῦναι τοῖς θλίβουσιν ὑμᾶς θλίψιν): Heb. viii. 13 'He hath *made* the first *old* (πεπαλαίωκεν τὴν πρώτην); now that which *decayeth* (παλαιούμενον) and *waxeth old* (γηράσκον) is ready to vanish away': James ii. 2, 3 'If there *come* (εἰσέλθῃ) unto your assembly

Digitized by Google

a man with a gold ring *in goodly apparel* (ἐν ἐσθῆτι λαμπρᾷ) and there *come in* (εἰσέλθῃ) also a poor man in vile *raiment* (ἐσθῆτι), and ye have respect to him that weareth *the gay clothing* (τὴν ἐσθῆτα τὴν λαμπράν) etc.': 2 Pet. ii. 1, 3 'Who privily shall bring in *damnable heresies* (αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας)...and bring on themselves swift *destruction* (ἀπώλειαν)...and their *damnation* (ἀπώλεια) slumbereth not': 1 John v. 9, 10 'This is the *witness* (μαρτυρία) of God which he *hath testified* (μεμαρτύρηκεν) of his Son...He believeth not the *record* (μαρτυρίαν) that God *gave* (μεμαρτύρηκεν) of his Son': Rev. i. 15 'His *voice* (φωνή) as the *sound* (φωνή) of many waters': iii. 17 'I am *rich* (πλούσιος) and *increased in goods* (πεπλούτηκα)': xvii. 6, 7 'And when I saw her, I *wondered* (ἐθαύμασα) with great *admiration* (θαῦμα); and the angel said unto me, Wherefore didst thou *marvel* (ἐθαύμασας)': xviii. 2 'And *the hold* (φυλακή) of every foul spirit and *a cage* (φυλακή) of every unclean and hateful bird.'

In the instances hitherto given the variation of rendering is comparatively unimportant, but for this very reason they serve well to illustrate the wrong principle on which our translators proceeded. In such cases no more serious consequences may result than a loss of point and force. But elsewhere the injury done to the understanding of the passage is graver. Thus when the English reader finds in S. Matthew xxv. 46 'These shall go away into *everlasting* (αἰώνιον) punishment, but the righteous into life *eternal* (αἰώνιον),' he is led to speculate

Digitized by Google

on the difference of meaning between 'everlasting' and 'eternal,' if he happens to have any slight acquaintance with modern controversy, and he will most probably be led to a wrong conclusion by observing different epithets used, more especially as the antithesis of the clauses helps to emphasize the difference. Or take instances where the result will not be misunderstanding, but non-understanding. Thus in the apocalyptic passage 2 Thess. ii. 6, 7 'And now ye know what *withholdeth* (*τὸ κατέχον*)... only he who now *letteth* (*ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι*) will let,' the same word should certainly have been repeated, that the identity of the thing signified might be clear; and in the doctrinal statement, Col. ii. 9, 10, 'In him dwelleth all the *fulness* (*τὸ πλήρωμα*) of the Godhead bodily, and ye are *complete* (*πεπληρωμένοι*) in him,' it was still more necessary to preserve the connexion by a similar rendering, for the main idea of the second clause is the *communication of the πλήρωμα* which resides in Christ to the believers (comp. Ephes. i. 23). Again, the word *θρόνος* in the Revelation is translated *throne*, when it refers to our Lord, but *seat*, when it refers to the faithful (iv. 4, xi. 16[1]), or when it refers to Satan (ii. 13, xvi. 10). Now by this variation, as Archbishop Trench has pointed out[2], two great ideas which run through this Book, and indeed we may say through the whole of the New Testa-

[1] Rev. iv. 4 'And round the throne (*θρόνου*) were four and twenty seats (*θρόνοι*).'

[2] *On the Authorized Version*, p. 53 sq.

Digitized by Google

a man with a gold ring *in goodly apparel* (ἐν ἐσθῆτι λαμπρᾷ) and there *come in* (εἰσέλθῃ) also a poor man in vile *raiment* (ἐσθῆτι), and ye have respect to him that weareth *the gay clothing* (τὴν ἐσθῆτα τὴν λαμπράν) etc.': 2 Pet. ii. 1, 3 'Who privily shall bring in *damnable heresies* (αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας)...and bring on themselves swift *destruction* (ἀπώλειαν)...and their *damnation* (ἀπώλεια) slumbereth not': 1 John v. 9, 10 'This is the *witness* (μαρτυρία) of God which he *hath testified* (μεμαρτύρηκεν) of his Son...He believeth not the *record* (μαρτυρίαν) that God *gave* (μεμαρτύρηκεν) of his Son': Rev. i. 15 'His *voice* (φωνή) as the *sound* (φωνή) of many waters': iii. 17 'I am *rich* (πλούσιος) and *increased in goods* (πεπλούτηκα)': xvii. 6, 7 'And when I saw her, I *wondered* (ἐθαύμασα) with great *admiration* (θαῦμα); and the angel said unto me, Wherefore didst thou *marvel* (ἐθαύμασας)': xviii. 2 'And *the hold* (φυλακή) of every foul spirit and *a cage* (φυλακή) of every unclean and hateful bird.'

In the instances hitherto given the variation of rendering is comparatively unimportant, but for this very reason they serve well to illustrate the wrong principle on which our translators proceeded. In such cases no more serious consequences may result than a loss of point and force. But elsewhere the injury done to the understanding of the passage is graver. Thus when the English reader finds in S. Matthew xxv. 46 'These shall go away into *everlasting* (αἰώνιον) punishment, but the righteous into life *eternal* (αἰώνιον),' he is led to speculate

Digitized by Google

on the difference of meaning between 'everlasting' and 'eternal,' if he happens to have any slight acquaintance with modern controversy, and he will most probably be led to a wrong conclusion by observing different epithets used, more especially as the antithesis of the clauses helps to emphasize the difference. Or take instances where the result will not be misunderstanding, but non-understanding. Thus in the apocalyptic passage 2 Thess. ii. 6, 7 'And now ye know what *withholdeth* (*τὸ κατέχον*)... only he who now *letteth* (*ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι*) will let,' the same word should certainly have been repeated, that the identity of the thing signified might be clear; and in the doctrinal statement, Col. ii. 9, 10, 'In him dwelleth all the *fulness* (*τὸ πλήρωμα*) of the Godhead bodily, and ye are *complete* (*πεπληρωμένοι*) in him,' it was still more necessary to preserve the connexion by a similar rendering, for the main idea of the second clause is the *communication of the* πλήρωμα which resides in Christ to the believers (comp. Ephes. i. 23). Again, the word *θρόνος* in the Revelation is translated *throne,* when it refers to our Lord, but *seat,* when it refers to the faithful (iv. 4, xi. 16[1]), or when it refers to Satan (ii. 13, xvi. 10). Now by this variation, as Archbishop Trench has pointed out[2], two great ideas which run through this Book, and indeed we may say through the whole of the New Testa-

[1] Rev. iv. 4 'And round the throne (*θρόνου*) were four and twenty seats (*θρόνοι*).'

[2] *On the Authorized Version*, p. 53 sq.

Digitized by Google

ment, are obliterated; the one that the true servants of Christ are crowned with Him and share His sovereignty; the other, that the antagonism of the Prince of Darkness to the Prince of Light develops itself in 'the hellish parody of the heavenly kingdom.' And in other passages again the connexion between different parts of the same discourse or the same narrative is severed. Thus in S. Luke xix. 13, 15, the nobleman going into a far country gives charge to his servants *πραγματεύσασθε ἐν ᾧ ἔρχομαι*, and when he returns, he summons them *ἵνα γνῷ* [or *γνοῖ*] *τίς τι διεπραγματεύσαντο*. If the former had been translated '*Trade* ye till I come,' it would then have corresponded to the nobleman's subsequent demand of them to 'know how much each man had gained by *trading*.' But the rendering of our translators, '*Occupy* till I come,' besides involving a somewhat unintelligible archaism disconnects the two, and the first indication which the English reader gets that the servants were expected to employ the money in trade is when the master at length comes to reckon with them. Another instance, where the connexion is not indeed wholly broken (for the context will not suffer this) but greatly impaired, is Matt. v. 15, 16 *λάμπει πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ· οὕτως λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, which should run 'It *shineth* upon all that are in the house: *Even so* let your light *shine* before men, etc.' But in our translation, 'It *giveth light* unto all that are in the house: Let your light *so shine* before men that they may see

Digitized by Google

your good works, etc.,' the two sentences are detached from each other by the double error, of rendering λάμπει, λαμψάτω, by different words, and of misunderstanding οὕτως. I say 'misunderstanding,' because the alternative that 'so' is a mere ambiguity of expression seems to be precluded by the fact that in our Communion Service the words 'Let your light *so* shine before men, etc.,' detached from their context, are chosen as the *initial* sentence at the Offertory, where the correct meaning, 'in like manner,' could not stand.

This love of variety might be still further illustrated by their treatment of the *component parts* of words. Thus there is no reason why πολυμέρως καὶ πολυτρόπως in Heb. i. 1 should be translated 'At *sundry* times and in *divers* manners,' even though for want of a better word we should allow the very inadequate rendering *times* to pass muster, where the original points to the divers *parts* of one great comprehensive scheme. And again in Mark xii. 39 (comp. Matt. xxiii. 6) it is equally difficult to see why πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ πρωτοκλισίας ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις should be rendered 'the *chief* seats in the synagogues and the *uppermost* rooms at feasts.' On the archaic rendering 'room' for the second element in πρωτοκλισία, I shall have something to say hereafter.

These instances which have been given will suffice. But in fact examples, illustrating this misconception of a translator's duty, are sown broadcast over

Digitized by Google

our New Testament, so that there is scarcely a page without one or more. It is due to our translators however to say, that in many cases, which I have examined, they only perpetuated and did not introduce the error, which may often be traced to Tyndale himself, from whom our version is ultimately derived: and in some instances his variations are even greater than theirs. Thus in a passage already quoted, 1 Cor. xii. 4 sq., he has three different renderings of διαιρέσεις in the three successive clauses, where they have only two; 'Ther are *diversities* of gyftes verely, yet but one sprete, and ther are *differences* of administration and yet but one lorde, and ther are *divers maners* of operacions and yet but one God'; and in Rom. xvi his interchanges of 'salute' and 'greet' are still more frequent than theirs. Of all the English Versions the Rhemish alone has paid attention to this point, and so far compares advantageously with the rest, to which in most other respects it is confessedly inferior. And I suppose that the words of our translators' preface, in which they attempt to justify their course, must refer indirectly to this Roman Catholic Version, more especially as I find that its Latinisms are censured in the same paragraph. If so, it is to be regretted that prejudice should have blinded them to a consideration of some importance.

But not only is it necessary to preserve the same word in the same context and in the same book; equal care should be taken to secure uniformity, where it occurs in the same connexion in different

Digitized by Google

passages and different books. Thus, where quotations are given once or more from the Old Testament in the New, the rendering should exhibit (as far as possible) the exact coincidence with or divergence from the original and one another in the language. Again, when the same discourses or the same incidents are recorded by different Evangelists, it is especially important to reproduce the features of the original, neither obliterating nor creating differences. Again, in parallel passages in allied epistles, as for instance those of S. Paul to the Romans and Galatians, or to the Colossians and Ephesians, or the Epistle of S. Jude and the Second Epistle of S. Peter, the exact amount of resemblance should be reproduced, because questions of date and authenticity are affected thereby. Again, in the writings which claim the same authorship, as for instance the Gospel and Epistles and the Apocalypse of S. John, the similarity of diction should be preserved. Though this will be a somewhat laborious task, let us hope that our new revisers will exercise constant vigilance in this matter. As the authors of our Received Version allowed themselves so much licence in the same context, it is no surprise that they did not pay any attention to these coincidences of language which occur in separate parts of the New Testament, and which did not therefore force themselves on their notice.

Of their mode of dealing with quotations from the Old Testament, one or two instances will suffice by way of illustration.

Digitized by Google

Deut. xxxii. 35 is twice quoted in exactly the same words. In our English Version it appears in these two forms.

Rom. xii. 19.	Heb. x. 30.
Vengeance is mine: I will repay, saith the Lord.	Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord.

Again, the same words Gen. xv. 6 (LXX) ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην are given with these variations: Rom. iv. 3 'It was *counted unto* him for righteousness'; Rom. iv. 22 'It was *imputed unto* him for righteousness'; Gal. iii. 6 'It was *accounted to* him for righteousness' (with a marginal note 'or *imputed*'); James ii. 23 'It was *imputed to* him for righteousness'; while in an indirect reference to it, Rom. iv. 9, (in the immediate context of two of these divergent renderings) a still further variation is introduced, 'We say that faith was *reckoned to* Abraham for righteousness.'

Again, καλύψει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν (from Prov. x. 12) is translated in James v. 20 'shall *hide a* multitude of sins,' and in 1 Pet. iv. 8 'shall *cover the* multitude of sins' (with a marginal reading 'will' for 'shall').

The variation in the last instance which I shall give is still more astonishing, because the two quotations of the same passage (Ps. xcv. 11) occur in the same context.

Digitized by Google

Heb. iii. 11.	Heb. iv. 3.
So I *sware* in my wrath, *They shall not* enter into my rest.	*As* I *have sworn* in my wrath, *If they shall* enter into my rest.

Here there is absolutely no difference in the Greek of the two passages; and, as the argument is continuous, no justification of the various renderings can be imagined.

On the parallel narratives of the different Evangelists it will not be necessary to dwell, because this part of the subject has been discussed at some length elsewhere[1]. I will content myself with three examples. The first, which affects only the diction, is a fair sample of the defects of our Version in this respect, because it is in no way striking or exceptional.

Matt. xvi. 26.	Mark viii. 36.	Luke ix. 25.
Τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος, ἐὰν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῇ;	Τί γὰρ ὠφελήσει ἄνθρωπον, ἐὰν κερδήσῃ τὸν κόσμον ὅλον, καὶ ζημιωθῇ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ;	Τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος, κερδήσας τὸν κόσμον ὅλον, ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθείς;
'For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?'	'For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?'	'For what is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world, and lose himself, or be cast away?'

[1] See for instance Dean Alford's *Byways of New Testament Criticism*, Contemporary Review, July 1868.

Digitized by Google

Here the coincidences and divergences of the first two Evangelists are fairly preserved; but the relations of the third to either are wholly confused or obliterated.

My second example shall be of a different kind; where the variation introduced affects not the expression only, but the actual interpretation.

In the explanation of the parable of the sower in S. Mark iv. 16 *οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπειρόμενοι* is properly translated 'they which *are sown* on stony ground,' and the corresponding expressions are treated similarly; but in S. Matthew xiii. 20 *ὁ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπαρείς* becomes, 'He that *received the seed* into stony places,' where (besides minor variations) the person is substituted for the seed, and the corresponding expressions throughout the parable are manipulated similarly in defiance of grammar. This rendering is unhappy on many accounts. Besides making the Evangelists say different things, it has the still further disadvantage, that it destroys one main idea in the parable, the *identification* (for the purposes of the parable) *of the seed when sown with the person himself*, so that the life and growth and decay of the one are coincident with the life and growth and decay of the other. The form of expression in S. Luke (viii. 14 *τὸ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας πεσὸν οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες*) brings out this identity more prominently; but it is expressed not obscurely in the other Evangelists, and should not have been obliterated by our translators in one of them through an ungrammatical paraphrase.

Digitized by Google

My third example concerns the treatment of a single word. In the account of the scenes preceding the Crucifixion, mention is made of a certain building which by three of the Evangelists is called *πραιτώριον*. In S. Matthew (xxvii. 27) it is translated 'common-hall,' with a marginal alternative 'governor's house'; in S. John (xviii. 28, 33, xix. 9) 'hall of judgment' and 'judgment-hall,' with a marginal alternative 'Pilate's house' in the first passage; while in S. Mark (xv. 16) it is reproduced in the English as 'prætorium.' It should be added that this same word when it occurs in the same sense, though referring to a different locality, in Acts xxiii. 35 is rendered 'judgment-hall,' though a 'judgment-hall' would obviously be an unfit place to keep a prisoner in ward; and again in Phil. i. 13 *ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ πραιτωρίῳ* (where probably it signifies the 'prætorian army,' but where our English translators have taken it to mean another such building) it appears as 'palace.' This last rendering might very properly have been adopted in all the passages in the Gospels and Acts, as adequately expressing the meaning.

So also in those epistles which are allied to each other[1], the treatment of identical words and expressions is neither more nor less unsatisfactory than in the Gospels.

In the instances already given, though there may be differences of opinion as to the importance of the

[1] See Blunt's *Duties of the Parish Priest*, p. 71, Ellicott's *Revision of the English New Testament*, p. 118.

Digitized by Google

Here the coincidences and divergences of the first two Evangelists are fairly preserved; but the relations of the third to either are wholly confused or obliterated.

My second example shall be of a different kind; where the variation introduced affects not the expression only, but the actual interpretation.

In the explanation of the parable of the sower in S. Mark iv. 16 *οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπειρόμενοι* is properly translated 'they which *are sown* on stony ground,' and the corresponding expressions are treated similarly; but in S. Matthew xiii. 20 *ὁ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπαρείς* becomes, 'He that *received the seed* into stony places,' where (besides minor variations) the person is substituted for the seed, and the corresponding expressions throughout the parable are manipulated similarly in defiance of grammar. This rendering is unhappy on many accounts. Besides making the Evangelists say different things, it has the still further disadvantage, that it destroys one main idea in the parable, the *identification* (for the purposes of the parable) *of the seed when sown with the person himself*, so that the life and growth and decay of the one are coincident with the life and growth and decay of the other. The form of expression in S. Luke (viii. 14 *τὸ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας πεσὸν οὗτοί εἰσὶν οἱ ἀκούσαντες*) brings out this identity more prominently; but it is expressed not obscurely in the other Evangelists, and should not have been obliterated by our translators in one of them through an ungrammatical paraphrase.

Digitized by Google

My third example concerns the treatment of a single word. In the account of the scenes preceding the Crucifixion, mention is made of a certain building which by three of the Evangelists is called *πραιτώριον*. In S. Matthew (xxvii. 27) it is translated 'common-hall,' with a marginal alternative 'governor's house'; in S. John (xviii. 28, 33, xix. 9) 'hall of judgment' and 'judgment-hall,' with a marginal alternative 'Pilate's house' in the first passage; while in S. Mark (xv. 16) it is reproduced in the English as 'prætorium.' It should be added that this same word when it occurs in the same sense, though referring to a different locality, in Acts xxiii. 35 is rendered 'judgment-hall,' though a 'judgment-hall' would obviously be an unfit place to keep a prisoner in ward; and again in Phil. i. 13 *ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ πραιτωρίῳ* (where probably it signifies the 'prætorian army,' but where our English translators have taken it to mean another such building) it appears as 'palace.' This last rendering might very properly have been adopted in all the passages in the Gospels and Acts, as adequately expressing the meaning.

So also in those epistles which are allied to each other[1], the treatment of identical words and expressions is neither more nor less unsatisfactory than in the Gospels.

In the instances already given, though there may be differences of opinion as to the importance of the

[1] See Blunt's *Duties of the Parish Priest*, p. 71, Ellicott's *Revision of the English New Testament*, p. 118.

Digitized by Google

subject, all probably will agree on the main point that it is advisable to preserve uniformity of rendering. The illustration which I shall next select is more open to criticism; and, as Archbishop Trench and Dean Alford and the Five Clergymen all take a different view from my own[1], I can hardly hope that my argument will carry general conviction. Yet the case seems to be strong. I refer to the translation of παράκλητος in the Gospel and in the First Epistle of S. John. In the former it is consistently translated *Comforter* (xiv. 16, 26, xv. 26, xvi. 7), while in the one passage where it occurs in the latter (ii. 1) the rendering *Advocate* is adopted. Is there sufficient reason for this difference? No one probably would wish to alter the word 'Advocate' in the Epistle, for the expressions in the context, 'with the Father,' 'Jesus Christ the *righteous* (δίκαιον),' 'a propitiation for our sins,' fix the sense, so that the passage presents a sufficiently close parallel with the common forensic language of S. Paul (e.g. Rom. iii. 24—26). But why should the same word be rendered 'Comforter' in the Gospel? Now I think it may fairly be maintained *first*, that the word παράκλητος in itself means 'Advocate' and cannot mean 'Comforter'; and *secondly*, that the former rendering is more

[1] To the same effect also writes Archdeacon Hare, *Mission of the Comforter*, Note J, p. 523, 'At present so many sacred associations have connected themselves for generation after generation with the name of *the Comforter*, that it would seem something like an act of sacrilege to change it.' Yet he agrees substantially with the view of the meaning which I have maintained in the text.

Digitized by Google

appropriate to the context in all the passages in which it occurs.

On the *first* point—the meaning of the word—usage appears to be decisive. It commonly signifies 'one who is summoned to the side of another (*παρακαλεῖται*)' to aid him in a court of justice, and more particularly 'an advocate' or 'a pleader,' being applied especially to the 'counsel for the *defence*[1]'; nor, so far as I am aware, does it ever bear any other sense, except perhaps in some later ecclesiastical writers whose language has been influenced by a false interpretation of these passages in S. John. In other words *παράκλητος* is passive, not active; one who *παρακαλεῖται*, not one who *παρακαλεῖ*; one who 'is summoned to plead a cause,' not one who 'exhorts or encourages or comforts.' Nor indeed, if we compare the simple word *κλητός* and the other compounds *ἀνάκλητος*, *ἔγκλητος*, *ἔκκλητος*, *ἐπίκλητος*, *σύγκλητος* etc., or if we observe the general rule affecting adjectives similarly formed from transitive verbs, does it seem easy to assign an active sense to *παράκλητος*. Yet it can hardly be doubted that the rendering 'Comforter' was reached by attributing this active force to *παράκλητος*, and that therefore it arises out of an error; for the Holy Spirit, the Para-

[1] See Hermann, *Griech. Antiq.* III. § 142, p. 320. The origin of this sense is illustrated by such passages as Æschines *c. Ctesiph.* § 200, *καὶ τί δεῖ σε Δημοσθένη παρακαλεῖν; ὅταν δ' ὑπερπηδήσας τὴν δικαίαν ἀπολογίαν παρακαλῇς κακοῦργον ἄνθρωπον καὶ τεχνίτην λόγων, κλέπτεις τὴν ἀκρόασιν κ.τ.λ.*

Digitized by Google

clete, is again and again explained by the Fathers as one who παρακαλεῖ[1], encourages or comforts men; and the fact that even Greek writers are found to explain the word thus is the only substantial argument (so far as I know) which has been brought against the view here maintained. It is urged indeed that the word 'Comforter,' being derived from the Latin 'confortator,' 'strengthener,' and therefore implying something more than 'comfort' in the restricted sense of 'consolation,' adequately represents the function of the παράκλητος who thus strengthens the cause and confirms the courage of the accused at the bar of justice. But the history of the interpretation, as already given, shows that this rendering was not reached in the way assumed, but was based on a grammatical error; and therefore this account can only be accepted as an apology after the fact and not as an explanation of the fact. Moreover it is not fair

[1] So Origen *de Princ.* ii. 7 (I. p. 93), a passage which unfortunately is extant only in the Latin, but in which (if correctly represented) Origen takes παράκλητος both in the Gospel and in the Epistle in an active sense, explaining it however *consolator* in the Gospel and *deprecator* in the Epistle. See also Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* xvi. 20 (p. 255), παράκλητος δὲ καλεῖται διὰ τὸ παρακαλεῖν καὶ παραμυθεῖσθαι καὶ συναντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῆς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν. And many of the Greek Fathers explain it similarly. The fact to be observed is, that even in the Epistle, where it manifestly has the sense 'Advocate,' they equally derive it from παρακαλεῖν and not παρακαλεῖσθαι, thus giving it an active force; whereas the passage quoted in the last note shows that the meaning 'Advocate' is not to be derived in this way. The Latin fathers generally follow the old Latin 'Advocatus'; but Hilary, though most frequently giving 'Advocatus,' yet once at least renders it 'Consolator' (*in Psalm.* cxxv, I. p. 461).

Digitized by Google

translating to substitute a subordinate and accidental conception for the leading sense of a word. And lastly, whatever may be the derivation of 'Comforter,' the word does not now suggest this idea to the English reader.

But *secondly*, if 'Advocate' is the only sense which παράκλητος can properly bear, it is also (as I cannot but think) the sense which the context suggests, wherever the word is used in the Gospel. In other words, the idea of pleading, arguing, convincing, instructing, convicting, is prominent in every instance[1]. Thus in xiv. 16 sq. the Paraclete is described as the 'Spirit of *truth*' whose reasonings fall dead on the ear of the world, and are vocal only to the faithful (ὃ ὁ κόσμος οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν...ὑμεῖς γινώσκετε αὐτό). In xiv. 26 again the function of the Paraclete is described in similar language, 'He shall *teach* you all things and *remind* you of all things.' In xv. 26 He is once more designated the 'Spirit of truth,' and here the office assigned to Him is to *bear witness* of Christ. And lastly in xvi. 7 sq. the idea of the *pleader* appears still more definitely in the context, for it is there declared that 'He shall convince' or 'convict (ἐλέγξει) the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment.' And generally it may be said that the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, is represented in these

[1] In xiv. 18 the English Version, 'I will not leave you *comfortless*,' lends a fictitious aid to the sense 'Comforter,' to which the original οὐκ ἀφήσω ὑμᾶς ὀρφανούς gives no encouragement. The margin however offers the alternative 'orphans' for ὀρφανούς.

Digitized by Google

passages as the Advocate, the Counsel, who suggests true reasonings to our minds and true courses of action for our lives, who convicts our adversary the World of wrong and pleads our cause before God our Father. In short the conception (though somewhat more comprehensive) is substantially the same as in S. Paul's language when describing the function of the Holy Ghost; 'The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are children of God,' 'The Spirit helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought, but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered (Rom. viii. 16, 26).'

Thus, whether we regard the origin of the word, or whether we consider the requirements of the context[1], it would seem that 'Comforter' should give

[1] In a case like this we should naturally expect tradition to aid in determining the correct sense, and for this purpose should apply to the earliest versions as giving it in its best authenticated form; but in the instance before us they do not render as much assistance as usual. (1) The Old *Latin* seems certainly to have had *Advocatus* originally in all the four passages of the Gospel, as also in the passage of the Epistle. It is true that in the existing texts *Paracletus* (or *Paraclitus*) occurs in one or more of the passages, and in some MSS in the others: but the earliest quotations from Tertullian onwards must be considered decisive on this point. So far therefore tradition favours the sense which I am maintaining. Jerome retained the Greek word 'Paracletus' in the Gospel, but gave 'Advocatus' in the Epistle. It would appear however that 'Paracletus' had already displaced 'Advocatus' in some passages in the Gospel in one or more of the many texts of the Old Latin which were current in the fourth century. (2) In the *Syriac* Versions the Greek word is retained. This is the case with the Curetonian in John xiv. 16 (the only passage preserved in this Version), and with the Peshito throughout in both the Gospel and the Epistle.

Digitized by Google

way to 'Advocate,' as the interpretation of παράκλητος. The word 'Comforter' does indeed express a true office of the Holy Spirit, as our most heartfelt experiences will tell us. Nor has the rendering, though inadequate, been without its use in fixing this fact in our minds; but the function of the Paraclete, as our Advocate, is even more important, because wider and deeper than this. Nor will the idea of the 'Comforter' be lost to us by the change, for the English *Te Deum* will still remain to recal this office of the Paraclete to our remembrance; while the restoration of the correct rendering in the passages of S. John's Gospel will be in itself an unmixed gain. Moreover (and this is no unimportant fact) the language of the Gospel will thus be linked in the English Version, as it is in the original, with the language of the Epistle. In this there will be a twofold advantage. We shall see fresh force in the words thus rendered, 'He will give you *another* Advocate,' when we remember that our Lord is styled by S. John our 'Advocate': the Advocacy of Christ illustrating and being illustrated by the Advocacy

(3) In the *Egyptian* Versions also this is generally the case. In the Memphitic παράκλητος appears in all the passages. In the Thebaic the rendering is different in the Gospels and in the Epistle. In the Epistle it is given, 'One that prayeth (entreateth) for (over) us'; but in the Gospel (at least in xiv. 16, xv. 26) the Greek word is retained. These parts of the Gospel in the Thebaic Version are not published, so far as I am aware; but I am enabled to state these facts from some manuscript additions made by Dr Tattam in my copy of Woide which was formerly in his possession.

Digitized by Google

of the Spirit. At the same time we shall bring out another of the many coincidences, tending to establish an identity of authorship in the Gospel and Epistle, and thus to make valid for the former all the evidences external and internal which may be adduced to prove the genuineness of the latter.

This connexion between the Gospel and the Epistle leads me to another illustration, which links the Gospel with the Apocalypse. The idea that the Shechinah, the σκηνή, the glory which betokened the Divine Presence in the Holy of Holies, and which was wanting to the second temple, would be restored once more in Messiah's days, was a cherished hope of the Jewish doctors during and after the Apostolic ages. In the Apocalypse S. John more than once avails himself of imagery derived from this expectation. Thus vii. 15 'He that sitteth on the throne shall *dwell among* them (σκηνώσει ἐπ' αὐτούς)'; xiii. 6 'He opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme His name and His *tabernacle* (σκηνήν), and them that *dwell* (τοὺς σκηνοῦντας) in heaven'; xxi. 3 'Behold the *tabernacle* (σκηνή) of God is with men, and He will *dwell* with them (σκηνώσει μετ' αὐτῶν).' Here it is much to be regretted that the necessities of the English language required our translators to render the substantive σκηνὴ by one word and the verb σκηνοῦν by another. In the first passage the significance is entirely lost by translating σκηνώσει 'shall dwell' combined with the erroneous rendering of ἐπί: and no English reader would suspect the reference to the

Digitized by Google

glory, the Shechinah, hovering over the mercy-seat[1]. But our regret is increased when we turn to the Gospel: for there also the same image reappears in the Greek, but is obliterated by the English rendering; 'The Word was made flesh, and *dwelt* (ἐσκήνωσεν) among us, and we beheld His *glory*.' The two writings, which attribute the name of the Word of God to the Incarnate Son, are the same also which especially connect Messiah's Advent with the restitution of the Shechinah, the light or glory which is the visible token of God's presence among men. In this instance the usage of the English language may have deterred our translators. Still they would have earned our gratitude, if following the precedent of the Latin *tabernaculavit* they had anticipated later scholars and introduced the verb 'to tabernacle' into the English language; or failing this, if by some slight periphrasis they had endeavoured to preserve the unity of idea.

In other cases where artificial distinctions are introduced, our translators must be held blameless, for the exigencies of the English language left them no choice. Thus in John iii. 8 τὸ πνεῦμα (the wind) ὅπου θέλει πνεῖ (bloweth).....οὕτως ἐστὶν πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος (the Spirit), we must patiently acquiesce in the different renderings, though

[1] In 2 Cor. xii. 9 ἵνα ἐπισκηνώσῃ ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Χριστοῦ, translated 'that the power of Christ *may rest upon* me,' there seems to be a similar reference to the symbol of the Divine Presence in the Holy of Holies.

Digitized by Google

the comparison between the material and immaterial πνεῦμα is impaired thereby; just as in a later passage (xx. 22 ἐνεφύσησεν καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Λάβετε Πνεῦμα ἅγιον) the symbolical act of breathing on the disciples loses much of its force to an English reader. Again it might be necessary to vary the renderings of ψύχη between 'soul' and 'life'; and of σώζειν between 'to save' and 'to make whole.' But in case of the former word such variations as we find for instance in Matth. xvi. 25, 26, and the parallel passages, deserve to be reconsidered; and in their treatment of the latter, as Dean Alford has shown[1], our translators have diversified the rendering capriciously.

And the same excuse also holds good with another class of words; where a *paronomasia* occurs in the original, but where it is impossible in English at once to preserve the similarity of sound and to give the sense adequately. In Phil. iii. 2, 3 indeed our translators, following some of the earlier versions, have endeavoured to reproduce the paronomasia, 'Beware of the *concision* (κατατομήν), for we are the *circumcision* (περιτομή)'; but the result is not encouraging, for it may be questioned whether 'concision' conveys any idea to the English reader. Again the attempt is made in Rom. xii. 3 μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν, ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν, but with no great success, for in the rendering 'not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think soberly,' the force of the original is evaporated.

[1] Contemporary Review, July 1868, p. 323.

Digitized by Google

On the other hand the rendering of 1 Cor. vii. 31 *οἱ χρώμενοι τούτῳ τῷ κόσμῳ* [*l. τὸν κόσμον*] *ὡς μὴ καταχρώμενοι*, 'they that *use* this world as not *abusing* it,' is adequate. In other passages such as Acts viii. 30 *γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις* 'understandest thou what thou readest?', 2 Cor. iii. 2 *γινωσκομένη καὶ ἀναγινωσκομένη* 'known and read,' 2 Cor. i. 13 *ἃ ἀναγινώσκετε ἢ καὶ ἐπιγινώσκετε* 'what you read or acknowledge,' 2 Cor. x. 12 *οὐ τολμῶμεν ἐγκρῖναι ἢ συγκρῖναι ἑαυτούς* 'we dare not make ourselves of the number or compare ourselves,' it would be impossible to reproduce the effect of the original. But in other cases such as 1 Cor. xii. 2 *ὡς ἂν ἤγεσθε, ἀπαγόμενοι* 'carried away as ye were led,' 2 Cor. iv. 8 *ἀπορούμενοι ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξαπορούμενοι* 'we are perplexed but not in despair,' or 2 Cor. vi. 10 *ὡς μηδὲν ἔχοντες καὶ πάντα κατέχοντες* 'as having nothing and yet possessing all things,' the rendering might be improved. Nor is there any reason why the play on *ἐργαζομένους, περιεργαζομένους*, in 2 Thess. iii. 11 should not be preserved by 'business,' 'busy-bodies'; or why in Ephes. v. 15 *μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι ἀλλ' ὡς σοφοὶ* should not be rendered 'not as unwise but as wise.' In this latter passage the word *ἄσοφος*, which occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, has been purposely preferred to the usual *μωρός*. Yet our translators have rendered *ἄσοφοι* 'fools' here, and reserved 'unwise' for *ἄφρονες* two verses below, where it is not wanted.

Digitized by Google

§ 3.

From the creation of artificial distinctions in our English Version by different renderings of the same word we pass naturally to the opposite fault, the obliteration of real distinctions by the same rendering of different words. The former error is easily corrected for the most part; the latter not always so. For the synonyms of one language frequently cannot be reproduced in another without a harsh expression or a cumbersome paraphrase. Thus *οἶδα, γινώσκω, ἔγνωκα, ἐπίσταμαι,* have different shades of meaning in Greek, but the obvious equivalent for each in English is 'I know.' Still some effort should be made (though success is not always possible) to discriminate between them, where they occur in the same context, and where therefore their position throws a special emphasis on the distinction. Thus in Acts xix. 15 we should not acquiesce in 'Jesus I know, and Paul I know,' as a rendering of *τὸν Ἰησοῦν γινώσκω καὶ τὸν Παῦλον ἐπίσταμαι,* though all the preceding translations unite with our Authorised Version in obliterating the difference. The significant distinction which is made in the original between the kind of recognition in the case of the Divine agent and of the human instrument may easily be preserved by rendering, 'Jesus I *acknow-*

Digitized by Google

ledge and Paul I *know*.' Again in such passages as 2 Cor. v. 16 *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐδένα οἴδαμεν κατὰ σάρκα, εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν, ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκομεν* (and this is a type of a large class of passages, where *οἶδα* and *γινώσκω* occur together) some improvement should be attempted; nor in the instance given could there be any difficulty in varying the rendering, though elsewhere the task might not prove so easy.

From these allied words I pass on to the distinction between *γινώσκειν* and *ἐπιγινώσκειν*, which is both clearer and more easily dealt with. Those who have paid any attention to the language of S. Paul will recognise the force of the substantive *ἐπίγνωσις* as denoting the advanced or perfect knowledge which is the ideal state of the true Christian, and will remember that it appears only in his later epistles (from the Romans onwards), where the more contemplative aspects of the Gospel are brought into view and its comprehensive and eternal relations more fully set forth. But the power of the preposition appears in the verb, no less than in the substantive; and indeed its significance is occasionally forced upon our notice, where the simple and the compound verb appear in the same context. Thus in 1 Cor. xiii. 12 *ἄρτι γινώσκω ἐκ μέρους, τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην*, the partial knowledge (*γινώσκειν ἐκ μέρους*, comp. ver. 9) is contrasted with the *full knowledge* (*ἐπιγινώσκειν*) which shall be attained hereafter, though our translators have rendered both words by

Digitized by Google

'know.' Yet strangely enough, where the special force of the compound was less obvious, it has not escaped them; for in 2 Cor. vi. 9 *ὡς ἀγνοούμενοι καὶ ἐπιγινωσκόμενοι* is translated 'as unknown and yet *well known*.'

In this particular—the observance of the distinction between a simple word and its derivatives compounded with prepositions—our English Version is especially faulty. The verb *κρίνειν* and its compounds will supply a good illustration. S. Paul especially delights to accumulate these; and thus by harping upon words (if I may use the expression) to emphasize great spiritual truths or important personal experiences. Thus he puts together *συγκρίνειν, ἀνακρίνειν*, 1 Cor. ii. 13—15; *κρίνειν, ἀνακρίνειν*, 1 Cor. iv. 3, 4; *ἐγκρίνειν, συγκρίνειν*, 2 Cor. x. 12; *κρίνειν, διακρίνειν*, 1 Cor. vi. 1—6; *κρίνειν, διακρίνειν, κατακρίνειν*, Rom. xiv. 22, 23, 1 Cor. xi. 29, 31, 32; *κρίνειν, κατακρίνειν*, Rom. ii. 1. Now it seems impossible in most cases, without a sacrifice of English which no one would be prepared to make, to reproduce the similarity of sound or the identity of root; but the distinction of sense should always be preserved. How this is neglected in our Version, and what confusion ensues from the neglect, the following instances will show. In 1 Cor. iv. 3, 4, 5, *ἐμοὶ δὲ εἰς ἐλάχιστόν ἐστιν ἵνα ὑφ' ὑμῶν ἀνακριθῶ...ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐμαυτὸν ἀνακρίνω...ὁ δὲ ἀνακρίνων με Κύριός ἐστιν...ὥστε μὴ πρὸ καιροῦ τι κρίνετε, ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ὁ Κύριος, ὃς καὶ φωτίσει τὰ κρυπτὰ τοῦ σκότους*, the word *ἀνακρίνειν* is translated through-

Digitized by Google

out 'judge'; while in a previous passage, 1 Cor. ii. 14, 15, it is rendered indifferently 'to discern' and 'to judge.' But *ἀνακρίνειν* is neither 'to judge,' which is *κρίνειν*, nor 'to discern,' which is *διακρίνειν*, but 'to examine, investigate, enquire into, question,' as it is rightly translated elsewhere, e.g. 1 Cor. ix. 3, x. 25, 27; and the correct understanding of the passage before us depends on our retaining this sense. The *ἀνάκρισις*, it will be remembered, was an Athenian law term for a preliminary investigation (distinct from the actual *κρίσις* or trial), in which evidence was collected and the prisoner committed for trial, if a true bill was found against him. It corresponded in short *mutatis mutandis* to the part taken in English law proceedings by the grand jury. And this is substantially the force of the word here. The Apostle condemns all these impatient human *præjudicia*, these unauthorised *ἀνακρίσεις*, which anticipate the final *κρίσις*, reserving his case for the great tribunal when at length *all* the evidence will be forthcoming and a satisfactory verdict can be given. Meanwhile this process of gathering evidence has begun; an *ἀνάκρισις* is indeed being held, not however by these self-appointed magistrates, but by One who alone has the authority to institute the enquiry, and the ability to sift the facts: *ὁ δὲ ἀνακρίνων με Κύριός ἐστιν.* Of this half technical sense of the word the New Testament itself furnishes a good example. The examination of S. Paul before Festus is both in name and in fact an *ἀνάκρισις*. The Roman procurator explains to Agrippa

Digitized by Google

how he had directed the prisoner to be brought into court (*προήγαγον αὐτόν*) in order that, having held the preliminary enquiry usual in such cases (*τῆς ἀνακρίσεως γενομένης*), he might be able to lay the case before the emperor (Acts xxv. 26). Thus S. Paul's meaning here suffers very seriously by the wrong turn given to *ἀνακρίνειν*; nor is this the only passage where the sense is impaired thereby. In 1 Cor. xiv. 24 *ἐλέγχεται ὑπὸ πάντων, ἀνακρίνεται ὑπὸ πάντων, [καὶ οὕτω] τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ φανερὰ γίνεται,* the sense required is clearly 'sifting, probing, revealing,' and the rendering of our translators 'he is judged of all' introduces an idea alien to the passage. Again, only five verses lower down (xiv. 29) another compound of *κρίνειν* occurs and is similarly treated, *προφῆται δε δύο ἢ τρεῖς λαλείτωσαν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι διακρινέτωσαν,* 'let the prophets speak two or three and let the other *judge*,' where it would be difficult to attach any precise meaning to the English without the aid of the Greek, and where certainly *διακρινέτωσαν* ought to be rendered 'discern' rather than 'judge.'

Another passage which I shall take to illustrate the mode of dealing with *κρίνειν* and its compounds is still more important. In 1 Cor. xi. 28—34, a passage in which the English rendering is chargeable with some serious practical consequences and where a little attention to the original will correct more than one erroneous inference, the rendering of *κρίνειν, διακρίνειν, κατακρίνειν,* is utterly confused. The Greek runs *δοκιμαζέτω δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτὸν καὶ οὕτως ἐκ τοῦ*

Digitized by Google

ἄρτου ἐσθιέτω καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ποτηρίου πινέτω· ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων [ἀναξίως] κρίμα ἑαυτῷ ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει, μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα [τοῦ Κυρίου]...εἰ δὲ ἑαυτοὺς διεκρίνομεν, οὐκ ἂν ἐκρινόμεθα, κρινόμενοι δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου παιδευόμεθα, ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν...εἴ τις πεινᾷ, ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω, ἵνα μὴ εἰς κρίμα συνέρχησθε, where the words in brackets should be omitted from the text. The English rendering corresponding to this is; 'But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup: for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh *damnation* to himself, not *discerning* the Lord's body...For if we would *judge* ourselves, we should not be *judged*. But when we are *judged*, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be *condemned* with the world...If any man hunger let him eat at home, that ye come not together unto *condemnation*.' Here the faults are manifold. In the *first* place κρίμα is rendered by two separate words 'damnation' and 'condemnation'; and, though we cannot fairly charge our translators with the inferences practically drawn from the first word, yet this is a blemish which we would gladly remove. But in fact both words are equally wrong, the correct rendering 'judgment' having in either case been relegated to the margin where it has lain neglected and has exercised no influence at all on the popular mind. And this circumstance (for it is only a sample of the fate which has befallen numberless valuable marginal readings elsewhere) suggests an important prac-

Digitized by Google

tical consideration. If the marginal renderings are intended for English-reading people (and for scholars they are superfluous), they will only then fulfil their purpose, when the margin is regarded as an integral portion of our English Bibles, and when it is ordered by authority that these alternative readings shall always be printed with the text. This then is the *second* error of our translators: *κρίνειν, κατακρίνειν*, are confused, when the force of the passage depends on their being kept separate; for these *κρίματα* in the Apostle's language are *temporary* judgments, differing so entirely from *κατάκριμα* that they are intended to have a chastening effect and to save from condemnation, as he himself distinctly states; *κρινόμενοι δὲ ὑπὸ Κυρίου παιδευόμεθα, ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν.* Lastly, the Version contains a *third* error in the confusion of *κρίνειν* and *διακρίνειν*; for whereas *διακρίνοντες τὸ σῶμα* is correctly translated '*discerning* the body of the Lord' at the first occurrence of *διακρίνειν*, yet when the word appears again, it is rendered 'judge' to the confusion of the sense; *εἰ ἑαυτοὺς διεκρίνομεν, οὐκ ἂν ἐκρινόμεθα*, 'If we *would judge* ourselves, we should not *be judged*,' where it ought to stand 'If we *had discerned* ourselves, we should not *have been judged*.' In fact S. Paul speaks of three stages, marked respectively by *διακρίνειν, κρίνειν*, and *κατακρίνειν*. The *first* word expresses the duty of persons before and in communicating; this duty is twofold, they must *discern* themselves and *discern* the Lord's body, that they may under-

Digitized by Google

stand and not violate the proper relations between the one and other. The *second* expresses the immediate consequences which ensue from the neglect of this duty—the *judgments* which are corrective and remedial, but not final. The *third* denotes the final *condemnation*, which only then overtakes a man, when the second has failed to reform his character. But this sequence is wholly obliterated in our Version. In Rom. xiv. 22, 23 again, where the words occur together, it would have been well to have kept the distinction, though here the confusion is not so fatal to the meaning: 'Happy is he that *condemneth* not himself (ὁ μὴ κρίνων ἑαυτὸν) in that thing which he alloweth (ἐν ᾧ δοκιμάζει): And he that *doubteth* (ὁ δὲ διακρινόμενος) is *damned* (κατακέκριται) if he eat, because he eateth not of faith.' S. Paul is not satisfied in this case, that a man should not condemn himself; he must not even *judge* himself. In other words the case must be so clear that he has no need to balance conflicting arguments with a view to arriving at a result. Otherwise he should abstain altogether, for his eating is not of faith. Here our translators have rendered διακρινόμενος rightly, but a misgiving appears to have occurred to them, for in the margin they add '*Or*, discerneth and putteth a difference between meats,' which would be the active ὁ διακρίνων. Indeed an evil destiny would seem to have pursued them throughout, when dealing with compounds of κρίνειν; for in another passage (2 Cor. i. 9) they render ἀπόκριμα 'sentence,' though the correct meaning 'answer' is given in the margin.

Digitized by Google

This neglect of prepositions in compound words is a very frequent fault in our Version. In the parable of the wheat and the tares indeed, though the correct reading describes the sowing in the one case by *σπείρειν* and in the other by *ἐπισπείρειν* (Matt. xiii. 24, 25), yet no blame can attach to our translators for not observing the distinction, as they had in their text the faulty reading *ἔσπειρε* for *ἐπέσπειρεν*. But elsewhere this excuse cannot be pleaded in their behalf. Thus in the parable of the wedding-feast there is a striking variation of language between the commission of the master and its execution by the servants, which ought not to have been effaced. The order given is *πορεύεσθε ἐπὶ τὰς διεξόδους τῶν ὁδῶν*, but as regards its fulfilment we read simply *ἐξελθόντες εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς* (Matt. xxii. 9, 10). In this change of expression we seem to see a reference to the imperfect work of the human agents as contrasted with the urgent and uncompromising terms of the command, which bade them scour the public thoroughfares, following all their outlets; and certainly it is slovenly work to translate both *τὰς διεξόδους τῶν ὁδῶν* and *τὰς ὁδοὺς* alone by the same rendering 'high-ways.' A similar defect again is the obliteration of the distinction between *δαπανᾶν* and *ἐκδαπανᾶν* in 2 Cor. xii. 15 'I will very gladly spend (*δαπανήσω*) and be spent (*ἐκδαπανηθήσομαι*) for you,' where 'wholly spent' would give the force of the compound. But examples of this kind might be multiplied. Would it not be possible, for

Digitized by Google

instance, to find some rendering, which without any shock to good taste would yet distinguish between φιλεῖν and καταφιλεῖν in such passages as Matt. xxvi. 48, 49 ὃν ἂν φιλήσω αὐτός ἐστιν...καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν, and Luke vii. 45, 46 φίλημά μοι οὐκ ἔδωκας, αὕτη δὲ...οὐ διέλιπεν καταφιλοῦσα τοὺς πόδας μου, so as to bring out the extravagance of the treachery in the one case and the depth of the devotion in the other, implied in the strong compound καταφιλεῖν?

Hardly less considerable is the injury inflicted on the sense by failing to observe the different force of prepositions, when not compounded. Of this fault one instance must suffice. In 2 Cor. iii. 11 εἰ γὰρ τὸ καταργούμενον διὰ δόξης, πολλῷ μᾶλλον τὸ μένον ἐν δόξῃ, 'For if that which is done away *was glorious*, much more that which remaineth *is glorious*,' the distinction of διὰ δόξης and ἐν δόξῃ is obliterated, though the change is significant in the original, where the *transitory flush* and the *abiding presence* are distinguished by the change of prepositions, and thus another touch is added to the picture of the contrast between the two dispensations.

Again, how much force is lost by neglecting a change of gender in the English rendering of Joh. i. 11 'He came *to his own* (εἰς τὰ ἴδια), and *his own* (οἱ ἴδιοι) received him not.' Here the distinction in the original between the neuter τὰ ἴδια and the masculine οἱ ἴδιοι at once recalls the parable in Matt. xxi. 33 sq., in which the vineyard corresponds to τὰ

Digitized by Google

ἴδια and the husbandmen to οἱ ἴδιοι; but our Version makes no distinction between the place and the persons—between 'His own home' and 'His own people.' Doubtless there is a terseness and a strength in the English rendering which no one would willingly sacrifice; but the sense ought to be the first consideration.

Let me pass to an illustration of another kind, where confusion is introduced by the same rendering of different verbs: 1 Cor. xiv. 36 'What, came the word of God out from you? or came it unto you only?' Here there appears to the English reader to be an opposition between *from* and *unto*, and the two interrogatives seem to introduce alternative propositions. The original however is ἢ ἀφ' ὑμῶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθεν ἢ εἰς ὑμᾶς μόνους κατήντησεν: where the fault of the English Version is twofold; the same word is used in rendering ἐξῆλθεν and κατήντησεν, and μόνους is represented by the ambiguous 'only.' Thus the emphasis is removed from the pronoun *you* in both clauses to the prepositions, and the two hypotheses are made to appear mutually exclusive. The translation of Tyndale, which was retained even in the Bishops' Bible, though somewhat harsh, is correct and forcible, 'Spronge the worde of God from you? Ether came it unto you only[1]?'

[1] A very important passage, in which the hand of the reviser is needed, may perhaps be noted here. The correct Greek Text of Matt. v. 32 is πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας, ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι, καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ μοιχᾶται, where

Digitized by Google

Much attention has been directed by recent writers to the synonymes of the New Testament. They have pointed out what is lost to the English reader by such confusions as those of *αὐλὴ fold* and *ποίμνη flock* in John x. 16, where in our Version the same word *fold* stands for both[1], though the point of our Lord's teaching depends mainly on the distinction between the many folds and the one flock; of *δοῦλοι* and *διάκονοι* in the parable of the wedding-feast (Matt. xxii. 1 sq.), both rendered by *servants*, though they have different functions assigned to them, and though they represent two distinct classes of beings—the one human, the other angelic ministers[2]; of *κόφινοι* and *σπυρίδες* in the miracles of feeding the five thousand and the four thousand respectively—both translated *baskets*—though the words are set over

our English Version has 'Whosoever shall put away his wife saving for the cause of fornication causeth her to *commit adultery:*' and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced *committeth adultery.*' Here the English Version casts equal blame on the woman, thus doing her an injustice, for obviously she is not in the same position with the husband as regards guilt; but the Greek *μοιχευθῆναι* (not *μοιχᾶσθαι*), being a passive verb, implies something quite different. In this instance however the fault does not lie at the door of our translators, who instead of *μοιχευθῆναι* had the false reading *μοιχᾶσθαι*; but, the correct text being restored, a corresponding change in the English rendering is necessary. Compare also the various reading in Matt. xix. 9.

[1] Tyndale and Coverdale preserve the distinction of *flock* and *fold*. In the Great Bible it disappears.

[2] Here again the older Versions generally preserve the distinction, translating *δοῦλοι*, *διάκονοι* by 'servants,' 'ministers,' respectively. The Rheims Version has 'waiters' for *διάκονοι*. In this case the Geneva Bible was the first to obliterate the distinction, which was preserved even in the Bishops'.

Digitized by Google

against each other in the evangelic narratives (Matt. xvi. 9, 10, Mark viii. 19, 20), and seem to point to a different nationality of the multitudes in the two cases; of *ζῷα* and *θηρία* in the Apocalypse, both represented by *beasts*, though the one denotes the beings who worship before the throne of heaven, and the other the monsters whose abode is the abyss beneath. For other instances, and generally for an adequate treatment of this branch of exegesis, I shall be content to refer to the works of Archbishop Trench and others; but the following examples, out of many which might be given, will serve as further illustrations of the subject, which is far from being exhausted.

In John xiii. 23, 25 *ἦν δὲ ἀνακείμενος εἷς ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ...ἀναπεσὼν ἐκεῖνος οὕτως ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ λέγει* 'Now there was *leaning on* Jesus' bosom one of his disciples... He then *lying on* Jesus' breast saith,' the English Version makes no distinction between the reclining position of the beloved disciple throughout the meal, described by *ἀνακείμενος*, and the sudden change of posture at this moment, introduced by *ἀναπεσών*. This distinction is further enforced in the original by a change in both the prepositions and the nouns, from *ἐν* to *ἐπί*, and from *κόλπος* to *στῆθος*. S. John was reclining on the bosom of his Master and he suddenly threw back his head upon His breast to ask a question. Again in a later passage a reference occurs—not to the reclining position but to the sud-

Digitized by Google

den movement[1]—in xxi. 20 ὃς καὶ ἀνέπεσεν ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν, where likewise it is misunderstood by our translators, 'which also *leaned on* his breast and said.' This is among the most striking of those vivid descriptive traits which distinguish the narrative of the fourth Gospel generally, and which are especially remarkable in these last scenes of Jesus' life, where the beloved disciple was himself an eye-witness and an actor. It is therefore to be regretted that these fine touches of the picture should be blurred in our English Bibles.

Again, in 1 Cor. xiv. 20 μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν, ἀλλὰ τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε, much force is lost by the English rendering, 'Be not *children* in understanding; howbeit in malice be ye *children*.' In the original S. Paul is not satisfied that his converts should be merely children in vice; they must be something less than this, they must be guileless as

[1] The word ἀναπίπτειν occurs several times in the New Testament and always signifies a *change* of position, for indeed this idea is inherent in the word. It is used of a rower bending back for a fresh stroke (e. g. Polyb. i. 21. 2), of a horse suddenly checked and rearing (Plat. *Phædr.* 254 B, E), of a guest throwing himself back on the couch or on the ground preparatory to a meal (Matt. xv. 35, John xiii. 12, etc.).

The received text of xiii. 25 runs, ἐπιπεσὼν δὲ ἐκεῖνος ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος κ.τ.λ., but the correct reading is as given above. The substitution of ἐπιπεσὼν however does not tell in favour of our translators; for this word ought to have shown, even more clearly than ἀναπεσών, that a *change* of posture was intended. The οὕτως, which appears in the correct text and gives an additional touch to the picture, has a parallel in iv. 6 ἐκαθέζετο οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ. In xxi. 20 there is no various reading.

Digitized by Google

babes; and we cannot afford to obliterate the distinction between *παιδία* and *νήπιοι*. Again in this same chapter (ver. 7) *ὅμως τὰ ἄψυχα φωνὴν διδόντα... ἐὰν διαστολὴν τοῖς φθόγγοις μὴ δῷ* is translated 'Even things without life giving *sound*...except they give a distinction in the *sounds*', where certainly different words should have been found for *φωνὴ* and *φθόγγος*; and yet our translators did not fail through poverty of expression, for three verses below they have rendered *φωναὶ voices* and *ἄφωνον without signification*. In the margin they suggest *tunes* for *φθόγγοις*, and this would be preferable to retaining the same word. As *φθόγγος* is used especially of musical sounds, perhaps *notes* might be adopted. This is just a case where a word not elsewhere found in the English Bible might be safely introduced, because there is no incongruity which jars upon the ear. Again in the following chapter (xv. 40) *ἑτέρα μὲν ἡ τῶν ἐπουρανίων δόξα, ἑτέρα δὲ ἡ τῶν ἐπιγείων. ἄλλη δόξα ἡλίου καὶ ἄλλη δόξα σελήνης καὶ ἄλλη δόξα ἀστέρων*, the words *ἄλλη* and *ἑτέρα* are translated alike, 'The glory of the celestial is one and the glory of the terrestrial is *another*. There is one glory of the sun, *another* glory of the moon, and *another* glory of the stars.' Yet it is hardly to be doubted that S. Paul purposely uses *ἑτέρα* when he is speaking of things belonging to different classes, as *ἐπουράνια* and *ἐπίγεια*, and *ἄλλη* when he is speaking of things belonging to the same class, as the sun and moon and stars; for this is the proper distinction between *ἄλλη* and *ἑτέρα*, that,

Digitized by Google

whereas the former denotes simply distinction of *individuals*, the latter involves the secondary idea of difference of *kind*. In fact the change in the form of the sentence by which δόξα, δόξα, from being marked out as the subjects by the definite article and distinguished by μὲν...δὲ in the first place, become simply predicates and are connected by καὶ...καὶ in the second, corresponds to the change from ἑτέρα to ἄλλη in passing from the one to the other. These words ἄλλος, ἕτερος, occur together more than once, and in all cases something is lost by effacing the distinction. In Gal. i. 6 θαυμάζω ὅτι οὕτω ταχέως μετατίθεσθε... εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο, translated 'I marvel that ye are so soon removed...unto *another* Gospel which is not *another*', the sense would be brought out by giving each word its proper force; and again in 2 Cor. xi. 4 ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν κηρύσσει ὃν οὐκ ἐκηρύξαμεν ἢ πνεῦμα ἕτερον λαμβάνετε ὃ οὐκ ἐλάβετε, though the loss is less considerable, the distinction might with advantage have been preserved. In these instances however a reviser might be deterred by the extreme difficulty in distinguishing the two, without introducing some modernism. In the passage first quoted (1 Cor. xv. 40) the end might perhaps be attained by simply substituting 'other' for 'another' in rendering ἑτέρα.

Still more important is it to mark the distinction between εἶναι and γίνεσθαι, where our translators have not observed it. Thus our English rendering of Joh. viii. 58, 'Before Abraham *was*, I *am*,' loses half the

Digitized by Google

force of the original, *πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, ἐγώ εἰμι*, 'Before Abraham *was born*, I *am*.' The *becoming* only can be rightly predicated of the patriarch; the *being* is reserved for the Eternal Son alone. Similar in kind, though less in degree, is the loss in the rendering of Luke vi. 36 *γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς* [*καὶ*] *ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν*, '*Be* ye merciful, as your Father also *is* merciful.' Here also the original expresses the distinction between the imperfect effort and the eternal attribute[1].

Illustrations of similar defects might be multiplied, though in many cases it is much easier to point out the fault, than to suggest the remedy. Thus such a rendering as 2 Cor. vii. 10 'For godly sorrow worketh *repentance* (*μετάνοιαν*) to salvation not to be *repented of* (*ἀμεταμέλητον*)' belongs to this class. Here the Geneva Testament has 'causeth amendment unto salvation not to be repented of,' and perhaps it were best in this instance to sacrifice the usual rendering of *μετάνοια* in order to preserve the distinction (unless indeed we are prepared to introduce the word 'regret' for *μεταμέλεια*), especially as *μεταμέλεσθαι* in the context is consistently translated 'repent.' Again it were desirable to find some better rendering of *πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον* in James i. 17 than 'every good *gift* and every perfect *gift*,' since a

[1] In 1 Pet. i. 16 our translators, when they gave the rendering '*Be* ye holy, for I *am* holy,' had before them the reading *ἅγιοι γένεσθε, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιός εἰμι*, but the correct text is *ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιος* (omitting *εἰμί*).

Digitized by Google

contemporary of S. James especially distinguishes *δόσις*, *δόμα*, from *δῶρον*, *δωρεὰ* etc., saying that the latter are much stronger and involve the idea of magnitude and fulness which is wanting to the former (Philo *Leg. All.* iii. 70, p. 126 *ἔμφασιν μεγέθους τελείων ἀγαθῶν δηλοῦσιν κ.τ.λ.*; comp. *de Cherub.* 25, p. 154), and applying to them the very same epithet 'perfect' which occurs in the passage before us. And yet the distinction would be dearly purchased at the cost of an offensive Latinism. But whatever difficulty there may be in finding different renderings here, it was certainly not necessary in the sentence immediately preceding, 'When lust hath conceived, it *bringeth forth* sin; and sin, when it is finished, *bringeth forth* death,' *ἡ ἐπιθυμία συλλαβοῦσα τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν, ἡ δὲ ἁμαρτία ἀποτελεσθεῖσα ἀποκύει θάνατον*, either to obliterate a real distinction by giving the same rendering of *τίκτει* and *ἀποκύει* or to create an artificial distinction by adopting different forms of sentences for *ἡ ἐπιθυμία συλλαβοῦσα* and *ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀποτελεσθεῖσα*. The English might run; 'Lust when it hath conceived bringeth forth sin, and sin when it is perfected (or 'grown') gendereth death.' Again in Rom. xii. 2 'Be not *conformed* to this world, but be ye *transformed* by the renewing of your mind', for *μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ μεταμορφοῦσθε τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοὸς* [*ὑμῶν*], the English not only suggests an identity of expression which has no place in the original but obliterates an important distinction between the *σχῆμα* or *fashion* and the *μορφὴ* or *form*, between

Digitized by Google

the outward and transitory and the abiding and substantial. We might translate *μὴ συσχημάτιζεσθε κ.τ.λ.* 'Be ye not fashioned after this world, but be ye transformed in the renewing, etc.,' thus partially retracing our steps and following on the track of Tyndale's and other earlier Versions, which have 'Fashion not yourselves like unto this world' and so preserve the distinction of *σχῆμα* and *μορφή* (though they are not very happy in their rendering of *μεταμορφοῦσθε* 'Be ye changed in your *shape*'). In this instance our translators have followed the guidance of Wycliffe and the Rheims Version, which have *conformed* and *reformed*. In another passage, Phil. ii. 6 sq., where the distinction of *μορφὴ* and *σχῆμα* is still more important, it is happily preserved in our Authorised Version; 'being in the *form* of God,' 'took upon him the *form* of a servant,' 'being found in *fashion* as a man.'

In other cases, where it is even more important for the sense to observe the distinction of synonymes, we seem to have no choice but to acquiesce in the confusion. At an earlier stage of the language it might have been possible to establish different renderings, but now the English equivalents are so stereotyped that any change seems impossible. Thus the rendering of *διάβολος* and *δαιμόνιον* by the same word 'devil' is a grievous loss; and it is much to be regretted that Wycliffe's translation of *δαιμόνιον* by 'fiend' was not adopted by Tyndale, in which case it would probably have become the current rendering. Now the sense of incongruity would make its adoption impossible.

Digitized by Google

Still greater misunderstanding arises from translating *Hades* the place of departed spirits, and *Gehenna* the place of fire and torment, by the same word 'hell,' and thus confusing two ideas wholly distinct. In such a passage as Acts ii. 27, 31 the misconception thus created is very serious. Is it possible even now to naturalise the word *Hades* and give it a place in our Version? or must we be satisfied with pointing out in the margin in each case whether the word 'hell' represents *Hades* or *Gehenna*? Another, though a less important instance, is the word 'temple', which represents both *ναός* the inner shrine or sanctuary and *ἱερόν* the whole of the sacred precincts. Thus in the English Version an utter confusion of localities results from a combination of two such passages as Matt. xxiii. 35 'Whom ye slew between the temple (*τοῦ ναοῦ*) and the altar' and Matt. xxi. 12 'Them that sold and bought in the temple' (*ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ*). In the first case for *τοῦ ναοῦ* S. Luke (xi. 51) uses *τοῦ οἴκου* 'the house', the building which is, as it were, the abode of the Divine Presence; but our English translators have boldly rendered even *τοῦ οἴκου* by 'the temple'. More hopeless still is it to preserve the distinction between *θυσιαστήριον* the Jewish and *βωμός* the Heathen altar, the latter word occurring only once in the New Testament (Acts xvii. 23) and the poverty of our language obliging us there to translate it by the same word as *θυσιαστήριον*.

The contrast of Jew and Gentile involved in these last words recalls another pair of synonymes, which

Digitized by Google

present the same relation to each other and in which the distinction is equally impracticable, λαός used especially of the chosen people and in contradistinction to the Gentiles (e. g. Acts iv. 25, 27. x. 2, xxi. 28, Rom. ix. 25, 26, 1 Pet. ii. 10, etc.), and δῆμος denoting the people of a heathen city and more particularly when gathered together in the popular assembly (e. g. at Cæsarea, Acts xii. 22[1]; at Thessalonica, Acts xvii. 5; at Ephesus, Acts xix. 30, 33).

§ 4.

Another class of errors, far more numerous and much more easily corrected than the last, is due to the imperfect knowledge of Greek *grammar* in the age in which our translators lived. And here it is instructive to observe how their accuracy fails for the most part just at the point where the Latin language ceases to run parallel with the Greek. In two remarkable instances, at all events, this is the case. The Latin language has only one past tense where the Greek has two; a Roman was forced to translate ἐλάλησα and λελάληκα by the same expression 'locutus

[1] A heathen multitude, such as would naturally be found in a city which was the seat of the Roman government, is contemplated here, as the whole incident shows. Hence Tyndale and the later Versions rightly translate θεοῦ φωνὴ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπου (ver. 22) 'The voice of *a* god and not of *a* man,' where Wycliffe has 'The voice of God and not of man.' When the *Jews* of Cæsarea are especially intended, ὁ λαὸς is used instead of ὁ δῆμος; Acts x. 2.

Digitized by Google

sum.' Accordingly we find that our English translators make no difference between the aorist and the perfect, apparently giving the most *obvious* rendering on each occasion and not being guided by any grammatical principle in the treatment of these tenses. Again the Latin language has no definite article; and correspondingly in our English Version its presence or absence is almost wholly disregarded. Indeed it would hardly be an exaggeration to say that, if the translators had been left to supply or omit the definite article in every case according to the probabilities of the sense or the requirements of the English, without any aid from the Greek, the result would have been about as accurate as it is at present.

I am not bringing any charge against the ability of our translators. To demand from them a knowledge of Greek Grammar which their age did not possess would be to demand an impossibility. Accustomed to write and to speak in Latin, they unconsciously limited the range and capacity of the Greek by the measure of the classical language with which they were most familiarly acquainted. But our own more accurate knowledge may well be brought to bear to correct these deficiencies. Tyndale had said truly that 'the Greek tongue agreeth more with the English than the Latin'; and it should be our endeavour to avail ourselves of this agreement and so to reproduce the meaning of the original with greater exactness. I hope to show, before I have done, that it is no mere pedantic affectation which would prompt

Digitized by Google

the outward and transitory and the abiding and substantial. We might translate μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε κ.τ.λ. 'Be ye not fashioned after this world, but be ye transformed in the renewing, etc.,' thus partially retracing our steps and following on the track of Tyndale's and other earlier Versions, which have 'Fashion not yourselves like unto this world' and so preserve the distinction of σχῆμα and μορφή (though they are not very happy in their rendering of μεταμορφοῦσθε 'Be ye changed in your *shape*'). In this instance our translators have followed the guidance of Wycliffe and the Rheims Version, which have *conformed* and *reformed*. In another passage, Phil. ii. 6 sq., where the distinction of μορφὴ and σχῆμα is still more important, it is happily preserved in our Authorised Version; 'being in the *form* of God,' 'took upon him the *form* of a servant,' 'being found in *fashion* as a man.'

In other cases, where it is even more important for the sense to observe the distinction of synonymes, we seem to have no choice but to acquiesce in the confusion. At an earlier stage of the language it might have been possible to establish different renderings, but now the English equivalents are so stereotyped that any change seems impossible. Thus the rendering of διάβολος and δαιμόνιον by the same word 'devil' is a grievous loss; and it is much to be regretted that Wycliffe's translation of δαιμόνιον by 'fiend' was not adopted by Tyndale, in which case it would probably have become the current rendering. Now the sense of incongruity would make its adoption impossible.

Digitized by Google

Still greater misunderstanding arises from translating *Hades* the place of departed spirits, and *Gehenna* the place of fire and torment, by the same word 'hell,' and thus confusing two ideas wholly distinct. In such a passage as Acts ii. 27, 31 the misconception thus created is very serious. Is it possible even now to naturalise the word *Hades* and give it a place in our Version? or must we be satisfied with pointing out in the margin in each case whether the word 'hell' represents *Hades* or *Gehenna*? Another, though a less important instance, is the word 'temple', which represents both *ναός* the inner shrine or sanctuary and *ἱερόν* the whole of the sacred precincts. Thus in the English Version an utter confusion of localities results from a combination of two such passages as Matt. xxiii. 35 'Whom ye slew between the temple (*τοῦ ναοῦ*) and the altar' and Matt. xxi. 12 'Them that sold and bought in the temple' (*ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ*). In the first case for *τοῦ ναοῦ* S. Luke (xi. 51) uses *τοῦ οἴκου* 'the house', the building which is, as it were, the abode of the Divine Presence; but our English translators have boldly rendered even *τοῦ οἴκου* by 'the temple'. More hopeless still is it to preserve the distinction between *θυσιαστήριον* the Jewish and *βωμός* the Heathen altar, the latter word occurring only once in the New Testament (Acts xvii. 23) and the poverty of our language obliging us there to translate it by the same word as *θυσιαστήριον*.

The contrast of Jew and Gentile involved in these last words recalls another pair of synonymes, which

Digitized by Google

the outward and transitory and the abiding and substantial. We might translate μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε κ.τ.λ. 'Be ye not fashioned after this world, but be ye transformed in the renewing, etc.,' thus partially retracing our steps and following on the track of Tyndale's and other earlier Versions, which have 'Fashion not yourselves like unto this world' and so preserve the distinction of σχῆμα and μορφή (though they are not very happy in their rendering of μεταμορφοῦσθε 'Be ye changed in your *shape*'). In this instance our translators have followed the guidance of Wycliffe and the Rheims Version, which have *conformed* and *reformed*. In another passage, Phil. ii. 6 sq., where the distinction of μορφὴ and σχῆμα is still more important, it is happily preserved in our Authorised Version; 'being in the *form* of God,' 'took upon him the *form* of a servant,' 'being found in *fashion* as a man.'

In other cases, where it is even more important for the sense to observe the distinction of synonymes, we seem to have no choice but to acquiesce in the confusion. At an earlier stage of the language it might have been possible to establish different renderings, but now the English equivalents are so stereotyped that any change seems impossible. Thus the rendering of διάβολος and δαιμόνιον by the same word 'devil' is a grievous loss; and it is much to be regretted that Wycliffe's translation of δαιμόνιον by 'fiend' was not adopted by Tyndale, in which case it would probably have become the current rendering. Now the sense of incongruity would make its adoption impossible.

Digitized by Google

Still greater misunderstanding arises from translating *Hades* the place of departed spirits, and *Gehenna* the place of fire and torment, by the same word 'hell,' and thus confusing two ideas wholly distinct. In such a passage as Acts ii. 27, 31 the misconception thus created is very serious. Is it possible even now to naturalise the word *Hades* and give it a place in our Version? or must we be satisfied with pointing out in the margin in each case whether the word 'hell' represents *Hades* or *Gehenna*? Another, though a less important instance, is the word 'temple', which represents both *ναός* the inner shrine or sanctuary and *ἱερόν* the whole of the sacred precincts. Thus in the English Version an utter confusion of localities results from a combination of two such passages as Matt. xxiii. 35 'Whom ye slew between the temple (*τοῦ ναοῦ*) and the altar' and Matt. xxi. 12 'Them that sold and bought in the temple' (*ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ*). In the first case for *τοῦ ναοῦ* S. Luke (xi. 51) uses *τοῦ οἴκου* 'the house', the building which is, as it were, the abode of the Divine Presence; but our English translators have boldly rendered even *τοῦ οἴκου* by 'the temple'. More hopeless still is it to preserve the distinction between *θυσιαστήριον* the Jewish and *βωμός* the Heathen altar, the latter word occurring only once in the New Testament (Acts xvii. 23) and the poverty of our language obliging us there to translate it by the same word as *θυσιαστήριον*.

The contrast of Jew and Gentile involved in these last words recalls another pair of synonymes, which

Digitized by Google

the outward and transitory and the abiding and substantial. We might translate μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε κ.τ.λ. 'Be ye not fashioned after this world, but be ye transformed in the renewing, etc.,' thus partially retracing our steps and following on the track of Tyndale's and other earlier Versions, which have 'Fashion not yourselves like unto this world' and so preserve the distinction of σχῆμα and μορφή (though they are not very happy in their rendering of μεταμορφοῦσθε 'Be ye changed in your *shape*'). In this instance our translators have followed the guidance of Wycliffe and the Rheims Version, which have *conformed* and *reformed*. In another passage, Phil. ii. 6 sq., where the distinction of μορφὴ and σχῆμα is still more important, it is happily preserved in our Authorised Version; 'being in the *form* of God,' 'took upon him the *form* of a servant,' 'being found in *fashion* as a man.'

In other cases, where it is even more important for the sense to observe the distinction of synonymes, we seem to have no choice but to acquiesce in the confusion. At an earlier stage of the language it might have been possible to establish different renderings, but now the English equivalents are so stereotyped that any change seems impossible. Thus the rendering of διάβολος and δαιμόνιον by the same word 'devil' is a grievous loss; and it is much to be regretted that Wycliffe's translation of δαιμόνιον by 'fiend' was not adopted by Tyndale, in which case it would probably have become the current rendering. Now the sense of incongruity would make its adoption impossible.

Digitized by Google

Still greater misunderstanding arises from translating *Hades* the place of departed spirits, and *Gehenna* the place of fire and torment, by the same word 'hell,' and thus confusing two ideas wholly distinct. In such a passage as Acts ii. 27, 31 the misconception thus created is very serious. Is it possible even now to naturalise the word *Hades* and give it a place in our Version? or must we be satisfied with pointing out in the margin in each case whether the word 'hell' represents *Hades* or *Gehenna*? Another, though a less important instance, is the word 'temple', which represents both *ναός* the inner shrine or sanctuary and *ἱερόν* the whole of the sacred precincts. Thus in the English Version an utter confusion of localities results from a combination of two such passages as Matt. xxiii. 35 'Whom ye slew between the temple (*τοῦ ναοῦ*) and the altar' and Matt. xxi. 12 'Them that sold and bought in the temple' (*ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ*). In the first case for *τοῦ ναοῦ* S. Luke (xi. 51) uses *τοῦ οἴκου* 'the house', the building which is, as it were, the abode of the Divine Presence; but our English translators have boldly rendered even *τοῦ οἴκου* by 'the temple'. More hopeless still is it to preserve the distinction between *θυσιαστήριον* the Jewish and *βωμός* the Heathen altar, the latter word occurring only once in the New Testament (Acts xvii. 23) and the poverty of our language obliging us there to translate it by the same word as *θυσιαστήριόν*.

The contrast of Jew and Gentile involved in these last words recalls another pair of synonymes, which

Digitized by Google

present the same relation to each other and in which the distinction is equally impracticable, λαός used especially of the chosen people and in contradistinction to the Gentiles (e. g. Acts iv. 25, 27. x. 2, xxi. 28, Rom. ix. 25, 26, 1 Pet. ii. 10, etc.), and δῆμος denoting the people of a heathen city and more particularly when gathered together in the popular assembly (e. g. at Cæsarea, Acts xii. 22[1]; at Thessalonica, Acts xvii. 5; at Ephesus, Acts xix. 30, 33).

§ 4.

Another class of errors, far more numerous and much more easily corrected than the last, is due to the imperfect knowledge of Greek *grammar* in the age in which our translators lived. And here it is instructive to observe how their accuracy fails for the most part just at the point where the Latin language ceases to run parallel with the Greek. In two remarkable instances, at all events, this is the case. The Latin language has only one past tense where the Greek has two; a Roman was forced to translate ἐλάλησα and λελάληκα by the same expression 'locutus

[1] A heathen multitude, such as would naturally be found in a city which was the seat of the Roman government, is contemplated here, as the whole incident shows. Hence Tyndale and the later Versions rightly translate θεοῦ φωνὴ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπου (ver. 22) 'The voice of *a* god and not of *a* man,' where Wycliffe has 'The voice of God and not of man.' When the *Jews* of Cæsarea are especially intended, ὁ λαὸς is used instead of ὁ δῆμος; Acts x. 2.

Digitized by Google

sum.' Accordingly we find that our English translators make no difference between the aorist and the perfect, apparently giving the most *obvious* rendering on each occasion and not being guided by any grammatical principle in the treatment of these tenses. Again the Latin language has no definite article; and correspondingly in our English Version its presence or absence is almost wholly disregarded. Indeed it would hardly be an exaggeration to say that, if the translators had been left to supply or omit the definite article in every case according to the probabilities of the sense or the requirements of the English, without any aid from the Greek, the result would have been about as accurate as it is at present.

I am not bringing any charge against the ability of our translators. To demand from them a knowledge of Greek Grammar which their age did not possess would be to demand an impossibility. Accustomed to write and to speak in Latin, they unconsciously limited the range and capacity of the Greek by the measure of the classical language with which they were most familiarly acquainted. But our own more accurate knowledge may well be brought to bear to correct these deficiencies. Tyndale had said truly that 'the Greek tongue agreeth more with the English than the Latin'; and it should be our endeavour to avail ourselves of this agreement and so to reproduce the meaning of the original with greater exactness. I hope to show, before I have done, that it is no mere pedantic affectation which would prompt

Digitized by Google

us to correct these faults; but that important interests, sometimes doctrinal, sometimes historical, are involved in their adjustment.

1. Under the head of faulty grammar, the *tenses* deserve to be considered first. And here I will begin with the defect on which I have already touched—the confusion of the *aorist* and the *perfect*. It is not meant to assert that the aorist can always be rendered by an aorist and the perfect by a perfect in English[1]. No two languages coincide exactly in usage, and allowance must be made for the difference. But still I think it will be seen that our Version may be greatly improved in this respect without violence to the English idiom.

Thus in John i. 3 *χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν*, or in 2 Cor. xii. 17, 18 *μή τινα ὧν ἀπέσταλκα πρὸς ὑμᾶς, δι' αὐτοῦ ἐπλεονέκτησα ὑμᾶς; παρεκάλεσα Τίτον καὶ συναπέστειλα τὸν ἀδελφόν*, or in Col. i. 16, 17, *ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα...τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται*, is there any reason why the tenses should not have been preserved, so that the distinction between the historical fact and the permanent result would have appeared in all three cases? Yet our translators have rendered *ἐγένετο, γέγονεν* equally by 'were made' in the first passage, *ἀπέσταλκα, ἀπέστειλα* by 'I sent' in the second, and *ἐκτίσθη, ἔκτισται* by 'were created'

[1] A comparison of English with the languages of continental Europe will illustrate the difference of idiom in this respect.

Digitized by Google

in the third. Again in 1 John iv. 9, 10, 14 *ἀπέσταλκεν, ἀπέστειλεν, ἀπέσταλκεν*, are all rendered in an aoristic sense 'he sent', though the appropriateness of either tense in its own context is sufficiently noticeable. On the other hand, in an exactly parallel case, 1 Cor. ix. 22 *ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἀσθένεσιν ἀσθενὴς ἵνα τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς κερδήσω· τοῖς πᾶσιν γέγονα πάντα*, where in like manner the aorist gives an isolated past incident, and the perfect sums up the total present result, the distinction of tenses is happily preserved, 'To the weak *became* I weak that I might gain the weak: I *am made* all things to all men': though 'I *am become*' would have been preferable, as preserving the same verb in both cases. But I fear that this correct rendering must be ascribed to accident: for the hap-hazard way in which these tenses are treated will appear as well from the instances already quoted as from such a passage as 2 Cor. vii. 13, 14; 'Therefore we were comforted (*παρακεκλήμεθα*) in your comfort, yea and exceedingly the more joyed we (*ἐχάρημεν*) for the joy of Titus, because his spirit was refreshed (*ἀναπέπαυται*) by you all. For if I have boasted (*κεκαύχημαι*) any thing to him of you, I am not ashamed (*κατῃσχύνθην*), but as we speak (*ἐλαλήσαμεν*) all things to you in truth, even so our boasting which I made before Titus ([*ἡ*] *ἐπὶ Τίτου*) is found (*ἐγενήθη*) a truth.'

Such passages as these bring out this weakness of our translation the more strikingly because the tenses appear in juxta-position. But it is elsewhere that

Digitized by Google

the most serious injury is inflicted on the sense. I will give examples of the *aorist* first; and I hope to make it clear that more than the interests of exact scholarship are concerned in the accurate rendering.

If I read S. Paul aright, the correct understanding of whole paragraphs depends on the retention of the aoristic sense, and the substitution of a perfect confuses his meaning, obliterating the main idea and introducing other conceptions which are alien to the passages. As illustrations of this, take two passages, Rom. vi. 1 sq., Col. ii. 11 sq. In the first passage, *ἀπεθάνομεν* (ver. 2), *ἐβαπτίσθημεν* (ver. 3), *συνετάφημεν* (ver. 4), *συνεσταυρώθη* (ver. 6), *ἀπεθάνομεν* (ver. 8), *ὑπηκούσατε* (ver. 17), *ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ* (ver. 18), *ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, δουλωθέντες τῷ Θεῷ* (ver. 22), *ἐθανατώθητε* (vii. 4), *κατηργήθημεν, ἀποθανόντες* (ver. 6). In the second passage, *περιετμήθητε* (ii. 11), *συνταφέντες, συνηγέρθητε* (ver. 12), *συνεζωοποίησεν* (ver. 13), *ἐδειγμάτισεν* (ver. 15), *ἀπεθάνετε* (ver. 20), *συνηγέρθητε* (iii. 1), *ἀπεθάνετε* (ver. 3). Now the consistency with which S. Paul uses the aorist in these two doctrinal passages which treat of the same subject (scarcely ever interposing a perfect, and then only for exceptional reasons which are easily intelligible) is very remarkable; 'Ye died, ye were buried, ye were raised, ye were made alive'; and the argument might be very much strengthened by reference to other passages where the Apostle prefers the aorist in treating of the same

Digitized by Google

topics[1]. In short, S. Paul regards this change—from sin to righteousness, from bondage to freedom, from death to life—as summed up in one definite act of the past; potentially to all men in our Lord's Passion and Resurrection, actually to each individual man when he accepts Christ, is baptized into Christ. Then he is made righteous by being incorporated into Christ's righteousness, he dies once for all to sin, he lives henceforth for ever to God. This is the *ideal*. Practically we know that the death to sin and the life to righteousness are inchoate, imperfect, gradual, meagrely realised even by the most saintly of men in this life: but S. Paul sets the matter in this ideal light, to force upon the consciences of his hearers the fact that an entire change came over them when they became Christians, that the knowledge and the grace then vouchsafed to them did not leave them where they were, that they are not and cannot be their former selves, and that it is a contradiction of their very being to sin any more. It is the definiteness, the absoluteness of this change, considered as a historical crisis, which forms the central idea of S. Paul's teaching, and which the aorist marks. We cannot therefore afford to obscure this idea by disregarding the distinctions of grammar. Yet

[1] For instance Gal. ii. 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, iii. 3, 27, v. 13, 24 (*οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν*), Ephes. i. 11, 13, ii. 5, 6 (*συνεζωοποίησεν, συνήγειρεν, συνεκάθισεν*), 13, 14, iv. 1, 4, 7, 30 (*ἐσφραγίσθητε*), Col. i. 13 (*ἐρρύσατο, μετέστησεν*), iii. 15, 2 Tim. i. 7, 9, Tit. iii. 5 (*ἔσωσεν*): see also 1 Pet. i. 3, 18, ii. 21, iii. 9.

Digitized by Google

in our English Version it is a mere chance whether in such cases the aorist is translated as an aorist.

The misconception which arises from this neglect of the aorist has vitally affected the interpretation of one passage. In 2 Cor. v. 14 'If one died for all, then *were* all *dead*' ([εἰ] εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον), our Version substitutes the state of death for the fact of dying, and thus interprets the death to be a death *through sin* instead of a death *to sin*. The reference in the context to the old things passing away, and the language of S. Paul elsewhere, *e.g.* Rom. vi. 2, 8, viii. 6, Col. ii. 20, iii. 3, already quoted, seem to show that the true sense is what would naturally be suggested by the correct rendering of the aorist; that all men have participated potentially in Christ's death, have died with Him to their former selves and to sin, and are therefore bound to lead a new life[1].

Not very unlike the passages, which I have been considering, is Acts xix. 2 εἰ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐλάβετε πιστεύσαντες, which our translators give 'Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?' It should run 'Did ye receive the Holy Ghost, when ye believed?' for the aorist of πιστεύειν is used very

[1] The only passages which would seem to favour the other interpretation are 1 Cor. xv. 22 ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν and Rom. v. 15 εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον. Yet even if this interpretation were adopted, the aoristic sense of ἀπέθανεν ought to be preserved; because the potential death of all men in Adam corresponds to the potential life of all men in Christ, and is regarded as having been effected once for all in Adam's transgression, as in Rom. v. 15.

Digitized by Google

commonly, not of the continuous state of belief, but of the definite act of accepting the faith; *e.g.* Acts xi. 17, Rom. xiii. 11, 1 Cor. iii. 5, xv. 2, Gal. ii. 7, etc.

The instances which have been given hitherto more or less directly affect *doctrine.* In the two next examples, which occur in quotations from the Old Testament, a *historical* connexion is severed by the mistranslation of the aorist. In Matt. ii. 15 ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱόν μου is rendered 'Out of Egypt *have I called* my son': but turning to the original passage in Hosea (xi. 1) we find that the proper aoristic sense must be restored; 'When Israel was a child, then I loved him and *called* my son out of Egypt.' Again in 2 Cor. iv. 13 ἐπίστευσα διὸ ἐλάλησα is given 'I believed and therefore *have I spoken*', a rendering unsuited to its position in the LXX of Ps. cxvi. 10 (cxv. 1), whence it is quoted.

Such examples as these however are very far from exhausting the subject. In one passage the aorist κτήσασθαι is treated as if κεκτῆσθαι, and rendered 'possess' instead of 'acquire', in defiance of a distinction which it does not require the erudition of Lord Macaulay's schoolboy to appreciate: Luke xxi. 19 ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν κτήσασθε [l. κτήσεσθε] τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, 'In your patience *possess* ye your souls'. Errors however occur also in this same word in 1 Thess. iv. 4 where the present is similarly treated, εἰδέναι ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σκεῦος κτᾶσθαι ἐν ἁγιασμῷ καὶ τιμῇ, 'that every one of you should know how to *possess* his vessel in sanctification and honour'; and again

Digitized by Google

in Luke xviii. 12 where ὅσα κτῶμαι is translated 'all that I *possess*': and thus it seems probable that the mistake first arose from a misapprehension of the meaning of κτᾶσθαι rather than from a direct confusion of tenses. Yet even so this very misapprehension must have been owing to the inability to see how the sense 'possess' is derived from the proper force of the perfect[1].

The treatment of the *perfect* is almost equally faulty with the treatment of the aorist. Thus in 1 Cor. xv. 4 sq. S. Paul lays the stress of his argument on the fact that Christ *is risen*. This perfect ἐγήγερται is repeated six times within a few verses (vv. 4, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20), while the aorist ἠγέρθη is not once used. The point is not that Christ *once rose from the grave*, but that having risen *He lives for ever*, as a first-fruit or earnest of the resurrection. Indeed the contrast between the tenses ὅτι ἐτάφη καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται (ver. 4) throws out this idea in still stronger relief. In the 13th and following verses this conception becomes so patent on the face of S. Paul's language that our translators could not fail to see it, and accordingly from this point onward the perfect is cor-

[1] In Matt. x. 9 μὴ κτήσησθε χρυσόν, the older Versions generally render κτήσησθε by 'possess', for which the A. V. substitutes 'provide', with the marginal alternative 'get'; and in Acts i. 18 ἐκτήσατο χωρίον the oldest Versions have 'hath possessed', for which the A. V. (after the Bishops' and Geneva Bibles) substitutes 'purchased'. These facts seem to show that the proper distinction between κτᾶσθαι and κεκτῆσθαι (which latter does not occur in the New Testament) was beginning to dawn upon Biblical scholars.

Digitized by Google

rectly translated: but the fact that in the two earliest instances where it occurs (vv. 4, 12) ἐγήγερται is treated as an aorist, 'he rose', shows that they did not regard the rules of grammar, but were guided only by the apparent demands of the sense. Another example, closely allied to the last, occurs in Heb. vii. 14, 22. The context lays stress on the *unchangeable* priesthood; 'Thou art a priest for ever', 'He continueth ever' (vv. 21, 24). Hence in ver. 14 the writer says πρόδηλον ὅτι ἐξ Ἰούδα ἀνατέταλκεν ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν, and in ver. 22 κατὰ τοσοῦτο καὶ κρείττονος διαθήκης γέγονεν ἔγγυος Ἰησοῦς. But these references to present existence are obliterated in the A. V., which substitutes aorists in both cases, 'Our Lord *sprang* out of Juda', '*was* Jesus *made* a surety'.

These instances have a more or less direct *doctrinal* bearing. The examples, which shall be given next, are important in a *historical* aspect. In the passage (2 Cor. xii. 2 sq.), in which S. Paul describes the visions vouchsafed to one 'caught up to the third heaven', it can hardly be doubted that he refers to himself. This appears not only from the connexion of the context, but also (in the original) from the mode of expression, οἶδα ἄνθρωπον, οἶδα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἄνθρωπον. I have already pointed out (p. 39) the capricious variations in the renderings of οἶδα, οἶδεν, in the context of this passage. But in these two clauses our translators are not only capricious but absolutely wrong, for they give to οἶδα an aoristic sense which it cannot possibly have, 'I *knew* a man', 'I *knew* such

Digitized by Google

a man'; thus disconnecting the actual speaker from the object of the vision, and suggesting to the English reader the idea that the Apostle is speaking of some past acquaintance.

Again S. Matthew in three several passages (i. 22, xxi. 4, xxvi. 56) introduces a reference to prophecies in the Old Testament, which have had their fulfilment in incidents of the Gospel history, by the words τοῦτο δὲ [ὅλον] γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῇ (or ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν) κ.τ.λ. In all three passages, it will be observed, the Evangelist has the perfect γέγονεν '*is come* to pass'; and in all three our English Version gives it as an aorist '*was* done'. Now it cannot be urged (as it might with some plausibility in the case of the Apocalypse) that S. Matthew is careless about the use of the aorist and the perfect, or that he has any special fondness for γέγονεν. On the contrary, though the aorist (ἐγένετο, γενέσθαι, etc.) frequently occurs in this Gospel, there are not many examples of the perfect γέγονεν; and in almost every instance our Version is faulty. In xix. 8 ἀπ' ἀρχῆς οὐ γέγονεν οὕτως the aoristic rendering 'From the beginning it *was not* so' entirely misleads the English reader as to the sense; in xxiv. 21 οἵα οὐ γέγονεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, 'Such as *hath not been* from the beginning', would (I suppose) be universally accepted as an improvement on the present translation 'Such as *was not* from the beginning'; and lastly in xxv. 6 κραυγὴ γέγονεν, the startling effect of the sudden surprise is expressed by the change of tense from the aorist, 'a cry *is raised*,' and

Digitized by Google

ought not to be neglected. When therefore this Evangelist in three distinct places introduces the fulfilment of a prophecy by γέγονεν, the fact cannot be without meaning. In two of these passages editors sometimes attach the τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν to the words of the previous speaker—of the angel in i. 22 and of our Lord in xxvi. 56—in order to explain the perfect. But this connexion is very awkward even in these two cases, and wholly out of the question in the remaining instance (xxi. 4). Is not the true solution this; that these tenses preserve the freshness of the earliest catechetical narrative of the Gospel history, when the narrator was not so far removed from the fact that it was unnatural for him to say 'This *is* come to pass'? I find this hypothesis confirmed when I turn to the Gospel of S. John. He too adopts a nearly identical form of words on one occasion to introduce a prophecy, but with a significant change of tense; xix. 36 ἐγένετο γὰρ ταῦτα ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ. To one writing at the close of the century, the events of the Lord's life would appear as a historic past; and so the γέγονεν of the earlier Evangelist is exchanged for the ἐγένετο of the later.

An able American writer on the English language, criticizing a previous effort at revision, remarks somewhat satirically that, judging from this revised version, the tenses 'are coming to have in England a force which they have not now in America[1].' Now I have

[1] Marsh's *Lectures on the English Language* no. xxviii. p. 633, speaking of the translation of S. John by the Five Clergymen. The

Digitized by Google

already conceded that allowance must be made from time to time for difference of idiom in rendering aorists and perfects: and I do not know to what passages in the revision issued by the Five Clergymen this criticism is intended to apply. But it is important that our new revisers should not defer hastily to such authority, and close too eagerly with a license which may be abused. The fact is, that our judgment in this matter is apt to be misled by two disturbing influences: we must be on our guard alike against the *idola fori* and against the *idola specus*.

First, the language of the Authorised Version is so wrought into the fabric of our minds by long habit, that the corresponding conception is firmly lodged there also. Thus it happens that when a change of words is offered to us, we unconsciously apply the new words to the old conception and are dissatisfied with them because they seem incongruous; and perhaps we conclude that English idiom is violated because they do not mean what we expect them to mean, not being prepared to make the necessary effort required to master the new conception involved in them. *Idola fori omnium molestissima sunt quæ ex fœdere verborum et nominum se insinuarunt in intellectum.*

But *secondly*, the idols of our cave are scarcely

passage is quoted by Bp. Ellicott (*Revision of the English New Testament* p. 13), who seems half disposed to acquiesce in the justice of the criticism.

Digitized by Google

less misleading than the idols of the market-place. Living in the middle of the nineteenth century, we cannot without an effort transfer ourselves to the modes of thought and of language, which were common in the first. The mistranslation from which this digression started affords a good instance of this source of misapprehension. We should not ourselves say 'This *is come* to pass,' in referring to facts which happened more than eighteen centuries ago, and therefore we oblige the eye-witnesses to hold our own language and say 'This *came* to pass.'

From the perfect tense I pass on to the *present*. And here I find a still better illustration of the errors into which we are led by following the *idola specus*. In the Epistle to the Hebrews the sacred writer, when speaking of the temple services and the Mosaic ritual, habitually uses the present tense: *e.g.* ix. 6, 7, 9 εἰσίασιν οἱ ἱερεῖς, προσφέρει ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ, δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι προσφέρονται, x. 1 θυσίαις ἃς προσφέρουσιν. Now I do not say that this is absolutely conclusive as showing that the Epistle was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, but it is certainly a valuable indication of an early date and should not have been obliterated. Yet our translators in such cases almost invariably substitute a past tense, as in the passages just quoted, 'the priests *went* in,' 'he *offered* for himself,' '*were* offered both gifts and sacrifices,' 'sacrifices which they *offered*.' And similarly in ix. 18 they render ἐγκεκαίνισται '*was* dedicated,' and in ix. 9 τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα 'the

Digitized by Google

already conceded that allowance must be made from time to time for difference of idiom in rendering aorists and perfects: and I do not know to what passages in the revision issued by the Five Clergymen this criticism is intended to apply. But it is important that our new revisers should not defer hastily to such authority, and close too eagerly with a license which may be abused. The fact is, that our judgment in this matter is apt to be misled by two disturbing influences: we must be on our guard alike against the *idola fori* and against the *idola specus*.

First, the language of the Authorised Version is so wrought into the fabric of our minds by long habit, that the corresponding conception is firmly lodged there also. Thus it happens that when a change of words is offered to us, we unconsciously apply the new words to the old conception and are dissatisfied with them because they seem incongruous; and perhaps we conclude that English idiom is violated because they do not mean what we expect them to mean, not being prepared to make the necessary effort required to master the new conception involved in them. *Idola fori omnium molestissima sunt quæ ex fœdere verborum et nominum se insinuarunt in intellectum.*

But *secondly*, the idols of our cave are scarcely

passage is quoted by Bp. Ellicott (*Revision of the English New Testament* p. 13), who seems half disposed to acquiesce in the justice of the criticism.

Digitized by Google

less misleading than the idols of the market-place. Living in the middle of the nineteenth century, we cannot without an effort transfer ourselves to the modes of thought and of language, which were common in the first. The mistranslation from which this digression started affords a good instance of this source of misapprehension. We should not ourselves say 'This *is come* to pass,' in referring to facts which happened more than eighteen centuries ago, and therefore we oblige the eye-witnesses to hold our own language and say 'This *came* to pass.'

From the perfect tense I pass on to the *present*. And here I find a still better illustration of the errors into which we are led by following the *idola specus*. In the Epistle to the Hebrews the sacred writer, when speaking of the temple services and the Mosaic ritual, habitually uses the present tense: *e.g.* ix. 6, 7, 9 *εἰσίασιν οἱ ἱερεῖς, προσφέρει ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ, δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι προσφέρονται*, x. 1 *θυσίαις ἃς προσφέρουσιν*. Now I do not say that this is absolutely conclusive as showing that the Epistle was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, but it is certainly a valuable indication of an early date and should not have been obliterated. Yet our translators in such cases almost invariably substitute a past tense, as in the passages just quoted, 'the priests *went* in,' 'he *offered* for himself,' '*were* offered both gifts and sacrifices,' 'sacrifices which they *offered*.' And similarly in ix. 18 they render *ἐγκεκαίνισται* '*was* dedicated,' and in ix. 9 *τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα* 'the

Digitized by Google

time *then* present.' Only in very rare instances do they allow the present to stand, and for the most part in such cases alone where it has no direct historical bearing. The temple worship was a thing of the remote past to themselves in the seventeenth century, and they forced the writer of the Epistle to speak their own language.

Another and a more important example of the present tense is the rendering of *οἱ σωζόμενοι*. In the language of the New Testament salvation is a thing of the past, a thing of the present, and a thing of the future. S. Paul says sometimes 'Ye (or we) were saved' (Rom. viii. 24), or 'Ye have been saved' (Ephes. ii. 5, 8), sometimes 'Ye are being saved' (1 Cor. xv. 2), and sometimes 'Ye shall be saved' (Rom. x. 9, 13). It is important to observe this, because we are thus taught that *σωτηρία* involves a moral condition which must have begun already, though it will receive its final accomplishment hereafter. Godliness, righteousness, is life, is salvation. And it is hardly necessary to say that the divorce of morality and religion must be fostered and encouraged by failing to note this and so laying the whole stress either on the past or on the future—on the *first call* or on the *final change*. It is therefore important that the idea of salvation as a rescue from sin through the knowledge of God in Christ, and therefore a progressive condition, a present state, should not be obscured; and we cannot but regret such a translation as Acts ii. 47 'The Lord added

Digitized by Google

to the Church daily such as *should be saved*,' where the Greek τοὺς σωζομένους implies a different idea. In other passages, Luke xiii. 23, 1 Cor. i. 18, 2 Cor. ii. 15, Rev. xxi. 24 (omitted in some texts), where οἱ σωζόμενοι occurs, the renderings 'be saved, are saved' may perhaps be excused by the requirements of the English language, though these again suggest rather a complete act than a continuous and progressive state.

In other cases the substitution of a past tense inflicts a slighter, but still a perceptible injury. It obscures the vividness of the narrative or destroys the relation of the sentences. Thus in Matt. iii. 1, 13, the appearing of John the Baptist and of our Lord are introduced in the same language: ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις παραγίνεται Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής, and τότε παραγίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς. It is a misfortune that we are obliged to translate the expression παραγίνεται by the very ordinary word 'come': but the English Version by rendering the first sentence 'In those days *came* John,' while it gives the second correctly 'Then *cometh* Jesus,' quite unnecessarily impairs both the vigour and the parallelism of the narrative. Exactly similar to this last instance is another in S. Luke vii. 33, 34, ἐλήλυθεν γὰρ Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής...ἐλήλυθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, where again the first ἐλήλυθεν is translated *came*, the second *is come*.

In rendering *imperfect* tenses, it is for the most part impossible to give the full sense without encum-

Digitized by Google

bering the English idiom unpleasantly. But in exceptional usages, as for instance where the imperfect has the inchoate, *tentative* force, its meaning can be preserved without any such sacrifice, and ought not to be obliterated. Thus in Luke i. 59 ἐκάλουν αὐτὸ Ζαχαρίαν is not 'They called it (the child) Zacharias,' but 'They *were for calling* it,' 'They *would have called* it.' Closely allied to this is the *conditional* sense of the imperfect, which again our English translators have rendered inadequately or not at all. Thus in Gal iv. 20 ἤθελον δὲ παρεῖναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἄρτι is not 'I *desire* to be present with you now,' as our translators have it, but 'I *could have* desired,' and in Matt. iii. 14 ὁ Ἰωάννης διεκώλυεν αὐτόν is not 'John *forbade* him,' but 'John *would have hindered* him.' Again in Rom. ix. 3 ηὐχόμην γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ the moral difficulty disappears, when the words are correctly translated, not as the English Version 'I *could* wish that myself were accursed for Christ,' but 'I *could have* wished,' etc.; because the imperfect itself implies that it is impossible to entertain such a wish, things being what they are. Again in Acts xxv. 22 ἐβουλόμην καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀκοῦσαι, the language of Agrippa is much more courteous and delicate than our English Version represents it. He does not say 'I *would* also *hear* the man myself,' but 'I myself also *could have wished to hear* the man,' if the favour had not been too great to ask. Elsewhere our Version is more accurate,

Digitized by Google

e.g. Acts vii. 26 *συνήλλασσεν αὐτοὺς εἰς εἰρήνην* '*would have* set them at one again[1].'

2. If the rendering of the tenses affords wide scope for improvement, this is equally the case with the treatment of the *definite article*. And here again I think it will be seen that theology is almost as deeply concerned as scholarship in the correction of errors. In illustration let me refer to the passage which the great authority of Bentley brought into prominence, and which has often been adduced since his time. In Rom. v. 15—19 there is a sustained contrast between '*the* one (*ὁ εἷς*)' and '*the* many (*οἱ πολλοί*),' but in the English Version the definite article is systematically omitted: 'If through the offence of *one*, *many* be dead,' and so throughout the passage, closing with, 'For as by *one man's* disobedience *many* were made sinners, so by the obedience of *one* shall *many* be made righteous.' In place of any comment of my own, I will quote Bentley's words. Pleading for the correct rendering he says; "By this accurate version some hurtful mistakes about partial redemption and absolute reprobation had been happily prevented. Our English readers had then seen, what several of the fathers saw and testified, that *οἱ πολλοὶ the many*, in an antithesis to *the one*, are equivalent to *πάντες all* in ver. 12 and comprehend the whole multitude, the

[1] Here however our translators appear to have read *συνήλασεν*, so that their accuracy is purely accidental.

Digitized by Google

entire species of mankind, exclusive only of *the one*[1]." In other words the benefits of Christ's obedience extend to all men potentially. It is only human self-will which places limits to its operation.

Taken in connexion with a previous illustration (p. 84 sq.), this second example from the Epistle to the Romans will enable us to estimate the amount of injury which is inflicted on S. Paul's argument by grammatical inaccuracies. Both the two great lines of doctrinal teaching respecting the Redemption, which run through this epistle—the one relating to the *mode of its operation*, the other to the *extent of its application*—are more or less misrepresented in our English Version owing to this cause. The former is obscured, as we saw, by a confusion of tenses; while the latter is distorted by a disregard of the definite article.

This however is the usual manner of treating the article when connected with πολλοὶ and similar words; e.g. Matt. xxiv. 12 'The love of *many* shall wax cold,' where the picture in the original is much darker, τῶν πολλῶν 'the many,' the vast majority of the disciples; or again Phil. i. 14 'And *many* of the brethren in the Lord waxing confident,' where the error is even greater, for S. Paul distinctly writes τοὺς πλείονας 'the greater part.' Similarly also it is neglected before λοιπός: e.g. Luke xxiv. 10 'And other women that were with them' (αἱ λοιπαὶ σὺν αὐταῖς); 1 Cor. ix. 4 'To lead about a sister, a wife, as well

[1] Bentley's *Works* III. p. 244 (ed. Dyce),

Digitized by Google

as *other* apostles' (ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι); 2 Cor. xii. 13 'Ye were inferior to other churches' (τὰς λοιπὰς ἐκκλησίας); in all which passages historical facts are obscured or perverted by the neglect of the article. And again in 2 Cor. ii. 6, where ἡ ἐπιτιμία ἡ ὑπὸ τῶν πλειόνων is rendered 'this punishment which was inflicted of *many*,' the conception of a regular judicial assembly, in which the penalty is decided by the vote of *the majority*, disappears.

Nor is the passage quoted by Bentley the only example in which the broad features of S. Paul's teaching suffer from an indifference to the presence or the absence of the definite article. The distinction between νόμος and ὁ νόμος is very commonly disregarded, and yet it is full of significance. Behind the concrete representation—the Mosaic law itself—S. Paul sees an imperious principle, an overwhelming presence, antagonistic to grace, to liberty, to spirit, and (in some aspects) even to life—abstract law, which, though the Mosaic ordinances are its most signal and complete embodiment, nevertheless is not exhausted therein, but exerts its crushing power over the conscience in diverse manifestations. The one—the concrete and special—is ὁ νόμος; the other—the abstract and universal—is νόμος. To the full understanding of such passages as Rom. ii. 12 sq., iii. 19 sq., iv. 13 sq., vii. 1 sq., Gal. iii. 10 sq., and indeed to an adequate conception of the leading idea of S. Paul's doctrine of law and grace, this distinction is indispensable.

Digitized by Google

The Gospels again will furnish illustrations of a somewhat different kind. To us 'Christ' has become a proper name, and, as such, rejects the definite article. But in the Gospel narratives, if we except the headings or prefaces and the after-comments of the Evangelists themselves (e.g. Matt. i. 1, Mark i. 1, John i. 17), no instance of this usage can be found. In the body of the narratives we read only of ὁ Χριστός, *the* Christ, *the* Messiah, whom the Jews had long expected, and who might or might not be identified with the person 'Jesus,' according to the spiritual discernment of the individual. Χριστὸς is no where connected with Ἰησοῦς in the Gospels with the exception of John xvii. 3, where it occurs in a prophetic declaration of our Lord ἵνα γινώσκωσιν τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν; nor is it used without the definite article in more than four passages, Mark ix. 41 ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστέ, Luke ii. 11 σωτὴρ ὅς ἐστιν Χριστὸς Κύριος, xxiii. 2 λέγοντα ἑαυτὸν Χριστόν, John ix. 22 αὐτὸν ὁμολογήσῃ Χριστόν, where the very exceptions strengthen the rule. The turning-point is the Resurrection: then and not till then we hear of 'Jesus Christ' from the lips of contemporary speakers (Acts ii. 38, iii. 6), and from that time forward Christ begins to be used as a proper name, with or without the article. This fact points to a rule which should be strictly observed in translation. In the Gospel narratives ὁ Χριστὸς should always be rendered '*the* Christ,' and never 'Christ' simply. In

Digitized by Google

some places our translators have observed this (e. g. Matt. xxvi. 63, Mark viii. 29), and occasionally they have even overdone the translation, rendering ὁ Χριστὸς by '*that* Christ' John i. 25, [vi. 69], or '*the very* Christ' John vii. 26; but elsewhere under exactly the same conditions the article is omitted, e. g. Matt. xvi. 16, xxiv. 5, Luke xxiii. 35, 39, etc. Yet the advantage of recognising its presence even in extreme cases, where at first sight it seems intrusive, would be great. In such an instance as that of Herod's enquiry, Matt. ii. 4 *ποῦ ὁ Χριστὸς γεννᾶται*, 'Where Christ should be born,' probably all would acknowledge the advantage of substituting '*the* Christ'; but would not the true significance of other passages, where the meaning is less obvious, be restored by the change? Thus in Matt. xi. 2 *ὁ δὲ Ἰωάνης ἀκούσας ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, the Evangelist's meaning is not that the Baptist heard what Jesus was doing, but that he was informed of one performing those works of mercy and power which the Evangelic prophet had foretold as the special function of the Messiah[1]. I have studiously confined the rigid application of this rule to the historical portions of the Gospels and excepted the Evangelists' own prefaces and comments: but even in these

[1] I find that the view, which is here maintained, of the use of Χριστὸς and ὁ Χριστὸς is different alike from that of Middleton (*Greek Article* on Mark ix. 41) and from those of others whom he criticizes. I should add that I wrote all these paragraphs relating to the definite article without consulting Middleton, and without conscious reminiscence of his views on any of the points discussed.

Digitized by Google

latter a passage is occasionally brought out with much greater force by understanding τὸν Χριστὸν to apply to the office rather than the individual, and translating it '*the* Christ.' In the genealogy of S. Matthew for instance, where the generations are divided symmetrically into three sets of fourteen, the Evangelist seems to connect the last of each set with a critical epoch in the history of Israel; the first reaching from the origin of the race to the commencement of the monarchy (ver. 6 'David *the king*'); the second from the commencement of the monarchy to the captivity in Babylon; the third and last from the captivity to the coming of the Messiah, *the* Christ (ἕως τοῦ Χριστοῦ). Connected with the title of the Messiah is that of *the* prophet who occupied a large space in the Messianic horizon of the Jews—the prophet whom Moses had foretold, conceived by some to be the Messiah himself, by others an attendant in his train. In one passage only (John vii. 40) is ὁ προφήτης, so used, rightly given in our Version. In the rest (John i. 21, 25, vi. 14) its force is weakened by the exaggerated rendering '*that* prophet'; while in the margin of i. 21 (as if to show how little they understood the exigencies of the article) our translators have offered an alternative, 'Art thou *a* prophet?'

As relating to the Person and Office of Christ another very important illustration presents itself. In Col. i. 19 S. Paul declares that ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι, which is rendered 'For it pleased *the Father* that in him should all fulness dwell.'

Digitized by Google

Here an important theological term is suppressed by the omission of the article; for τὸ πλήρωμα is '*the* fulness,' '*the* plenitude,' *pleroma* being a recognised expression to denote the totality of the Divine powers and attributes (Joh. i. 16, Eph. i. 23, iii. 19, iv. 13, Col. ii. 9), and one which afterwards became notorious in the speculative systems of the Gnostic sects. And with this fact before us, it is a question whether we should not treat τὸ πλήρωμα as a quasi-personality and translate 'In Him all *the* Fulness was pleased to dwell,' thus getting rid of the ellipsis which our translators have supplied by *the Father* in italics; but at all events the article must be preserved.

Again, more remotely connected with our Lord's office is another error of omission. It is true of Christianity, as it is true of no other religious system, that the religion is identified with, is absorbed in, the Person of its founder. The Gospel is Christ and Christ only. This fact finds expression in many ways: but more especially in the application of the same language to the one and to the other. In most cases this identity of terms is equally apparent in the English and in the Greek. But in one instance it is obliterated by a mistranslation of the definite article. Our Lord in S. John's Gospel, in answer to the disciple's question 'How can we know *the way*?' answers 'I am *the way*' (xiv. 5, 6). Corresponding to this we ought to find that in no less than four places in the Acts of the Apostles the Gospel is called '*the* way' absolutely; ix. 2 'If he found any that were of *the*

Digitized by Google

way (ἐάν τινας εὕρῃ τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας)'; xix. 9 'Divers believed not, but spake evil of *the way*'; xix. 23 'There arose no small stir about *the way*'; xxiv. 22 'Having more perfect knowledge of *the way*'; but in all these passages the fact disappears in the English Version, which varies the rendering between '*this* way' and '*that* way,' but never once translates τὴν ὁδόν '*the* way.'

But more especially are these omissions of the article frequent in those passages which relate to the Second Advent and its accompanying terrors or glories. The imagery of this great crisis was definitely conceived, and as such the Apostles refer to it. In the Epistles to the Thessalonians more especially S. Paul mentions having repeatedly dwelt on these topics to his converts; 'Remember ye not that when I was yet with you, I told you these things?,' 2 Thess. ii. 5. Accordingly, he appeals to incidents connected with the Second Advent, as known facts: ἐὰν μὴ ἔλθῃ ἡ ἀποστασία πρῶτον καὶ ἀποκαλυφθῇ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας [v. l. ἀνομίας] 'Except *the* falling away come first and *the* man of sin be revealed,' where our Version makes the Apostle say, '*a* falling away,' '*that* man of sin,' just as a little lower down it translates ὁ ἄνομος '*that* wicked,' instead of '*the* lawless one.' Similarly in the Epistle to the Hebrews (xi. 10) it is said of Abraham in the original that 'He looked for *the* city which hath *the* foundations (ἐξεδέχετο τὴν τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσαν πόλιν).' A definite image here rises before the sacred writer's mind of the new Jerusalem such as it is described in the Apocalypse, 'The wall of the

Digitized by Google

city had twelve foundations and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb (xxi. 14),' 'The foundations of the wall of the city were garnished with all manner of precious stones, etc.' (xxi. 19 sq.).[1] But in our Version the words are robbed of their meaning, and Abraham is made to look for '*a* city which hath foundations'—a senseless expression, for no city is without them. Again, in the Apocalypse the definite article is more than once disregarded under similar circumstances. Take for instance vii. 12, 14 'What are these which are arrayed in white robes (*τὰς στολὰς τὰς λευκάς*)?' with the reply, 'These are they which came out of great tribulation (*ἐκ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς μεγάλης*)'; xvii. 1 'That sitteth *on many waters*' (*ἐπὶ τῶν ὑδάτων τῶν πολλῶν*, for this was the reading in their text). And another instance, not very dissimilar, occurs in the Gospels. The same expression is used six times in S. Matthew (viii. 12, xiii. 42, 50, xxii. 13, xxiv. 51, xxv. 30) and once in S. Luke (xiii. 28) to describe the despair and misery of the condemned: *ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων*, where the rendering should be corrected into 'There shall be *the* wailing and *the* gnashing of teeth.'

The last instance which I shall take connected with this group of facts and ideas relating to the end of the world is more subtle, but not on that account less important. I refer to the peculiar sense of *ἡ ὀργή*, as occurring in a passage which has been variously explained, but which seems to admit only of one

[1] See Abp. Trench's *Authorized Version* p. 86.

Digitized by Google

probable interpretation, Rom. xii. 19 *μὴ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδικοῦντες, ἀγαπητοί, ἀλλὰ δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ· γέγραπται γὰρ Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει* Κύριος. With this compare Rom. v. 9 *σωθησόμεθα δι' αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς*, which is rendered 'We shall be saved from wrath through him,' and more especially 1 Thess. ii. 16 *ἔφθασεν* (*ἔφθακεν*) *δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀργὴ εἰς τέλος*, where the definite article is correctly reproduced in our Version, 'For *the* wrath is come upon them to the uttermost.' From these passages it appears that *ἡ ὀργή*, '*the* wrath,' used absolutely, signifies the Divine retribution; and the force of S. Paul's injunction in Rom. xii. 19 *δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ* is this; 'Do not avenge yourselves: do not anticipate the Divine retribution; do not thrust yourselves into God's place, but leave room for His judgments'—a sense which the English rendering 'rather give place unto wrath' does not suggest, and probably was not intended to represent. In the same way *τὸ θέλημα* is the Divine Will (Rom. ii. 18 *γινώσκεις τὸ θέλημα*[1]), and *τὸ ὄνομα* the

[1] This word *θέλημα* came to be so appropriated to the Divine Will, that it is sometimes used in this sense even without the definite article; e. g. Ignat. *Rom.* 1 *ἐάντερ θέλημα ᾖ τοῦ καταξιωθῆναί με* (the correct text), *Ephes.* 20 *ἐάν με καταξιώσῃ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ ὑμῶν καὶ θέλημα ᾖ, Smyrn.* 1 *υἱὸν Θεοῦ κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δύναμιν* [*Θεοῦ*] (where *Θεοῦ* is doubtful).

These passages point to the true interpretation of 1 Cor. xvi. 12 *οὐκ ἦν θέλημα ἵνα νῦν ἔλθῃ, ἐλεύσεται δὲ ὅταν εὐκαιρήσῃ* which is (I believe) universally interpreted as in our English Version 'his will was not to come,' but which ought to be explained 'It was not God's will that he should come.'

They also indicate, as I believe, the true reading in Rom. xv. 32 *ἵνα*

Digitized by Google

Divine name (Phil. ii. 9 τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα). In the last passage however it is unfair to charge our translators with an inaccurate rendering 'gave Him a name,' for their incorrect text omitted the article; but τὸ ὄνομα is the true reading, and it is superfluous to remark how much is gained thereby.

In other passages, where no doctrinal considerations are involved, a historical incident is misrepresented or the meaning of a passage is perverted by the neglect or the mistranslation of the article. Thus in two several passages S. Paul's euphemism of τὸ πρᾶγμα, when speaking of sins of the flesh, is effaced, and he is made to say something else: in 1 Thess. iv. 6 'That no man go beyond and defraud his brother in *any* matter' (ἐν τῷ πράγματι), where the sin of dishonest gain is substituted for the sin of unbridled sensuality by the mistranslation; and in 2 Cor. vii. 11 'Ye have approved yourselves to be clear in *this* matter (ἐν τῷ πράγματι)' where, though the perversion is much less considerable, a slightly different turn is given to the Apostle's meaning by substituting 'this' for 'the.' Again in 1 Cor. v. 9, where S. Paul is made to say, 'I wrote to you in *an* Epistle' (instead of '*my* Epistle' or 'letter'), the mistranslation of ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ has an important bearing on the interpretation of his allusion. Again in 2 Cor. xii. 18 'I desired Titus and with him I sent *a* brother (τὸν ἀδελ-

ἐν χαρᾷ ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς διὰ θελήματος, where various additions appear in the MSS, Θεοῦ in AC, κυρίου Ἰησοῦ in B, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in ℵ, Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ in DFG, but where θέλημα appears to be used absolutely.

Digitized by Google

φόν),' the error adds to the difficulty in discerning the movements of S. Paul's delegates previous to the writing of the letter. And in such renderings as John iii. 10 σὺ εἶ ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ; 'Art thou *a* master of Israel?', and Rev. iii. 17 σὺ εἶ ὁ ταλαίπωρος καὶ [ὁ] ἐλεεινὸς 'Thou art wretched and miserable,' though there is no actual misleading, the passages lose half their force by the omission.

In another class of passages some fact of geography or archæology lurks under the definite article, such as could proceed only from the pen of an eye-witness or at least of one intimately acquainted with the circumstances. In almost every instance of this kind the article is neglected in our Version, though it is obviously important at a time when the evidences of Christianity are so narrowly scanned, that these more minute traits of special knowledge should be kept in mind. Thus for instance in John xii. 13, 'They took branches of palm-trees,' the original has τὰ βαΐα τῶν φοινίκων '*the* branches of *the* palm-trees'—the trees with which the Evangelist himself was so familiar, which clothed the eastern slopes of the Mount of Olives and gave its name to the village of Bethany 'the house of dates.' Thus again in the Acts (ix. 35) the words translated 'Lydda and Saron' are Λύδδα καὶ τὸν Σαρωνᾶ, 'Lydda and *the* Sharon[1],' the former being the town, the latter

[1] The reading ἀσάρωνα or ἀσσάρωνα, which is found in some few second rate authorities, is a reproduction of the Hebrew, founded perhaps on the note of Origen (?) τινὲς δὲ ἀσσάρωνα φασίν, οὐχὶ σαρῶνα, ὅπερ

Digitized by Google

the district in the neighbourhood, and therefore having the definite article in this the only passage in which it occurs in the New Testament as it always has in the Old Testament, Hash-sharon, '*the* Sharon,' the woody plain, just as we talk of 'the Weald,' 'the Downs,' etc.[1] Again there is mention of '*the* pinnacle (*τὸ πτερύγιον*) of the temple' in the record of the temptation (Matt. iv. 5, Luke iv. 9)—the same expression likewise being used by the Jewish Christian historian Hegesippus in the second century, when describing the martyrdom of James the Lord's brother, who is thrown down from '*the πτερύγιον*'[2]; so that (whatever may be the exact meaning of the word translated 'pinnacle') some one definite place is meant, and the impression conveyed to the English reader by '*a* pinnacle' is radically wrong. Again in the history of the cleansing of the temple the reference to the seats of them that sold '*the* doves' (*τὰς περιστερὰς*) in two Evangelists (Matt. xxi. 12, Mark xi. 15) indicates the pen of a narrator, who was accustomed to the sight of the doves which might be purchased within the sacred precincts by worshippers intending to offer the purificatory offerings enjoined.

κρεῖττον (see Tisch. *Nov. Test. Græc.* ed. 8. II. p. 80). In direct contrast to this unconscious reduplication of the article stands the reading of ℵ (corrected however by a later hand) which omits the *τόν*, from not understanding the presence of the article.

[1] The illustration is Mr Grove's in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* s. v. Saron.

[2] In Euseb. *H.E.* ii. 23 *στῆθι οὖν ἐπὶ τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ...ἔστησαν οὖν οἱ προειρημένοι γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι τὸν Ἰάκωβον ἐπὶ τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ναοῦ.*

Digitized by Google

by the Mosaic law (Luke ii. 24). In like manner '*the* bushel' and '*the* candlestick' in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 15; comp. Mark iv. 21, Luke xi. 33) point to the simple and indispensable furniture in every homely Jewish household. And elsewhere casual allusions to '*the* cross-way' (Mark xi. 4), '*the* steep' (Mark v. 13, 'a steep place,' A. V.), '*the* synagogue' or '*our* synagogue' (Luke vii. 5, 'He hath built us a synagogue,' A. V.[1]), and the like—which are not unfrequent—all have their value, and ought not to be obscured.

But there are two remarkable instances of the persistent presence of the definite article—both connected with the Lake of Galilee—which deserve special attention, but which nevertheless do not appear at all to the English reader.

Most students of the New Testament have had their attention called to the fact that our Lord, before delivering the discourse which we call 'the Sermon on the Mount,' is recorded to have gone up not 'into a mountain' but 'into *the* mountain' (τὸ ὄρος) Matt. v. 1[2]; and they have been taught to observe also that S. Luke

[1] In Acts xvii. 1 also, where the A. V. has 'Thessalonica where was *a* synagogue of the Jews,' our translators certainly read ὅπου ἦν ἡ συναγωγή, though the article must be omitted in the Greek, if a strong combination of the oldest authorities is to have weight.

[2] Dean Stanley (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 361), supporting the traditional site of the 'Mount of Beatitudes,' writes: 'None of the other mountains in the neighbourhood could answer equally well to this description, inasmuch as they are merged into the uniform barrier of hills round the lake; whereas this stands separate—"the mountain," which

Digitized by Google

(vi. 17). in describing the locality where a discourse very similar to S. Matthew's Sermon on the Mount is held says, 'He came down with them and stood,' not (as our English Version makes him say) '*in the plain*' (as if ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ) but '*on a level place*' (ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινοῦ), where the very expression suggests that the spot was situated in the midst of a hilly country. Thus, by respecting the presence of the article in the one Evangelist and its absence in the other, the two accounts are so far brought into accordance that the description of the localities at all events offers no impediment to our identifying the discourses.

But it is important to observe in addition, that whenever the Evangelists speak of incidents occurring above the shores of the Lake of Galilee, they *invariably* use τὸ ὄρος[1] and never ὄρος or τὰ ὄρη, either of which at first sight would have seemed more natural. The probable explanation of this fact is that τὸ ὄρος stands for the mountain district—the hills as opposed to the level shores—more especially as the corre-

alone could lay claim to a distinct name, with the one exception of Tabor which is too distant to answer the requirement.' If the view which I have taken in the text be correct, this 'uniform barrier of hills' would itself be τὸ ὄρος: at all events the fact that τὸ ὄρος is the common expression in the Evangelists shows that the definite article does not distinguish the locality of the Sermon on the Mount from those of several other incidents in this neighbourhood; though possibly the independent reasons in favour of the traditional site may be sufficient without this aid.

[1] The only exceptions, I believe, to the insertion of the definite article, are in the cases of the temptation (Matt. iv. 8, [Luke iv. 5]), and of the transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 1, Mark ix. 2), in all which passages the expression is εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν [Μαν].

Digitized by Google

sponding Hebrew הָהָר is frequently so used, and in such cases is translated τὸ ὄρος in the LXX: e.g. 'the mountain of Judah,' 'the mountain of Ephraim,' Josh. xvii. 16, xix. 50, xx. 7, etc.[1] But, whatever may be the explanation, the article ought to be retained throughout.

Only less persistent[2] is the presence of the article in 'the ship' (τὸ πλοῖον) in connexion with the navigation of the sea of Galilee. Whatever may be the significance of this fact—whether it simply bears testimony to the vividness with which each scene in succession presented itself to the first narrator or narrators, or whether some one well-known boat was intended (as the narrative of Joh. vi. 22 sq. might suggest)—the article ought to have been preserved in the English Version; whereas in this case, as in the last, the translators have been guided not by grammar but by 'common sense,' for the most part translating τὸ ὄρος, τὸ πλοῖον, on each occasion where they

[1] It is no objection to this interpretation that S. Luke twice uses the more classical expression ἡ ὀρεινὴ in speaking of the hill-country of Judæa: i. 39, 65. Wherever he treads on the same ground with S. Matthew and S. Mark he has τὸ ὄρος. The portion of his narrative in which ἡ ὀρεινὴ occurs is derived from some wholly independent source.

[2] The common text however inserts the article in a few passages where it is absent from one or more of the best MSS (e. g. Matt. viii. 23, ix. 1, xiii. 2, xiv. 22, Mark iv. 1, vi. 30, 45). In Matt. xiv. 13 ἐν πλοίῳ is read by all the ancient authorities which have the words at all. In cases where the MSS differ it is not easy to see whether or not the omission of the article was a scribe's correction. Generally it may be said that the article with πλοῖον is more persistent in the other Evangelists than in S. Matthew.

Digitized by Google

appear first in connexion with a fresh incident by '*a* mountain,' '*a* ship,' and afterwards by '*the* mountain,' '*the* ship.'

Yet on the other hand, where this phenomenon appears in the original Greek, that is, where an object is indefinite when first introduced and becomes definite after its first mention, our translators have frequently disregarded this 'common sense' rule and departed from the Greek. Thus in the account of S. Peter's three denials in Mark xiv. 69, we are told that 'one of the maidservants (*μία τῶν παιδισκῶν*) of the high-priest' questioned him and elicited his first denial; then *ἡ παιδίσκη ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν πάλιν ἤρξατο λέγειν*, '*The* maidservant seeing him again began to say'; but our translators in the second passage render it '*a* maidservant,' thus making two distinct persons. The object was doubtless to bring the narrative into strict conformity with Matt. xxvi. 69, 71 (*μία παιδίσκη... ἄλλη*); but, though there might seem to be an immediate gain here, this disregard of grammar is really a hindrance to any satisfactory solution, where an exact agreement in details is unimportant, and where strict harmony if attainable must depend on the tumultuous character of the scene, in which more than one interrogator would speak at the same time[1]. Our translators however were at fault not through any want of honesty but from their imperfect knowledge of grammar, for they repeatedly err in the same way where no purpose is served; e.g. Mark ii. 15, 16,

[1] See the solution in Westcott's *Introduction to the Gospels*, p. 280.

Digitized by Google

'Many publicans and sinners (*πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοί*) sat also together with Jesus...and when the scribes and Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners (*μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν*)...How is it that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners (*μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν*)?' 1 Joh. v. 6 'This is he that came by water and blood (*δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος*), even Jesus Christ; not by water (*ἐν τῷ ὕδατι*) only, but by water (*ἐν τῷ ὕδατι*) and blood (*τῷ αἵματι*)'; Rev. xi. 9, 11 'Shall see their dead bodies three days and an half (*ἡμέρας τρεῖς καὶ ἥμισυ*)...And after three days and an half (*μετὰ τὰς τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ ἥμισυ*) etc.' Omissions of this class are very numerous.

The error of inserting the article where it is absent is less frequent than that of omitting it where it is present, but not less injurious to the sense. Thus in 1 Tim. iii. 11 *γυναῖκας ὡσαύτως σεμνὰς* would hardly have been rendered 'Even so must *their wives* be grave,' if the theory of the definite article had been understood; for our translators would have seen that the reference is to *γυναῖκας διακόνους*, 'women-deacons' or 'deaconesses,' and not to the wives of the deacons[1]. Again, in John iv. 27 *ἐθαύμαζον ὅτι μετὰ γυναικὸς*

[1] The office of deaconess is mentioned only in one other passage in the New Testament (Rom. xvi. 1); and there also it is obliterated in the English Version by the substitution of the vague expression 'which is a servant' for the more definite *οὖσαν διάκονον*. If the testimony borne in these two passages to a ministry of women in the Apostolic times had not been thus blotted out of our English Bibles, attention would probably have been directed to the subject at an earlier date, and our English Church would not have remained so long maimed in one of her hands.

Digitized by Google

ἐλάλει, the English Version 'They marvelled that He talked with *the* woman' implies that the disciples knew her shameful history—a highly improbable supposition, since she is obviously a stranger whose character our Lord reads through His divine intuition alone; whereas the true rendering, 'He talked with *a* woman,' which indeed alone explains the emphatic position of γυναικός, points to their surprise that He should break through the conventional restraints imposed by rabbinical authority and be seen speaking to one of the other sex in public[1]. Again in Luke vi. 16 ὃς [καὶ] ἐγένετο προδότης ought not to be translated 'Which also was *the* traitor,' because the subsequent history of Judas is not assumed to be known to S. Luke's readers, but 'Who also *became a* traitor.' Again it is important for geographical reasons that in Acts viii. 5 Philip should not be represented as going down 'to *the* city of Samaria' (εἰς πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας), if the reading which our translators had before them be correct[2], because the rendering may lead to a wrong identification of the place. And lastly, κατὰ ἑορτήν, which means simply 'at festival-time,' should not be translated 'at *the* feast' (Luke xxiii. 17), still less 'at *that* feast' (Matt. xxvii. 15, Mark xv. 6), because these renderings seem to limit the custom to the feast of the Passover—a limitation which is not implied in the original expression and certainly is not

[1] A rabbinical precept was, 'Let no one talk with a woman in the street, no not with his own wife': see Lightfoot's *Works*, II. p. 543.

[2] εἰς τὴν πόλιν however ought almost certainly to be read.

Digitized by Google

required by the parallel passage in S. John (xviii. 39). Happily in another passage (John v. 1 *μετὰ ταῦτα ἦν ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*), which is important in its bearing on the chronology of our Lord's life, our translators have respected the omission of the article before *ἑορτή*; but that their accuracy in this instance was purely accidental appears from the fact that a chapter later (vi. 4) *τὸ πάσχα ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων* is rendered 'the Passover, *a* feast of the Jews.'

But if, after the examples already given, any doubt could still remain that the theory of the definite article was wholly unknown to our translators, the following passages, in which almost every conceivable rule is broken, must be regarded as conclusive: Matt. iii. 4 *αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ἰωάνης εἶχεν τὸ ἔνδυμα* 'And *the same* John had his raiment' (where the true rendering 'But John himself' involves an antithesis of the prophetic announcement and the actual appearance of the Baptist); John iv. 37 *ἐν τούτῳ ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ ἀληθινός* 'Herein is that saying true'; *ib.* v. 44 *τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ* 'The honour that cometh from *God only*'; Acts xi. 17 *τὴν ἴσην δωρεὰν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς ὡς καὶ ἡμῖν πιστεύσασιν ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον* 'God gave them the like gift as He did unto us *who* believed on the Lord'; 1 Cor. viii. 10, 11 *ἡ συνείδησις αὐτοῦ ἀσθενοῦς ὄντος...τύπτοντες αὐτῶν τὴν συνείδησιν ἀσθενοῦσαν* 'The conscience of *him that is weak* ...wound *their weak* conscience'; 2 Cor. viii. 19 *πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου δόξαν* 'To the glory of *the same* Lord'; 1 Tim. vi. 2 *πιστοί εἰσιν καὶ ἀγαπητοὶ οἱ τῆς*

Digitized by Google

εὐεργεσίας ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι 'They are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit'; *ib.* vi. 5 νομιζόντων πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν 'Supposing that gain is godliness'; 2 Tim. ii. 19 ὁ μέντοι στερεὸς θεμέλιος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἕστηκεν 'Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure'; Heb. vi. 8 ἐκφέρουσα δὲ ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους ἀδόκιμος 'But *that which beareth* thorns and briars is rejected'; *ib.* vi. 16 πάσης αὐτοῖς ἀντιλογίας πέρας εἰς βεβαίωσιν ὁ ὅρκος 'An oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife'; *ib.* ix. 1 τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν 'And a worldly sanctuary'; *ib.* x. 1 ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις ἃς προσφέρουσιν 'With *those* sacrifices which they offered'; Rev. xix. 9 οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι ἀληθινοί εἰσι τοῦ Θεοῦ 'These are *the true sayings* of God.'

There is however one passage, in which this fault is committed and on which it may be worth while to dwell at greater length, because it does not appear to have been properly understood. In John v. 35 the words ἐκεῖνος ἦν ὁ λύχνος ὁ καιόμενος καὶ φαίνων, in which our Lord describes the Baptist, are translated in our Version 'He was a burning and a shining light.' Thus rendered, the expression appears as intended simply to glorify John. But this is not the sense which the context requires, and it is only attained by a flagrant disregard of the articles. Commentators have correctly pointed out that John is here called ὁ λύχνος 'the lamp'; he was not τὸ φῶς 'the light' (i. 8)[1]; for Christ Himself and Christ only

[1] Here again (i. 8) much is lost in the English Version by rendering οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς 'He was not *that* light.'

Digitized by Google

is '*the* light' (i. 9, iii. 19, ix. 5, etc.). Thus the rendering of ὁ λύχνος is vitally wrong, as probably few would deny. But it has not been perceived how much the contrast between the Baptist and the Saviour is strengthened by a proper appreciation of the remaining words ὁ καιόμενος καὶ φαίνων. The word καίειν is 'to burn, to kindle,' as in Matt. v. 15 οὐδὲ καίουσιν λύχνον 'Neither do men light a candle': so too Luke xii. 35 οἱ λύχνοι καιόμενοι, Rev. iv. 5, viii. 10. Thus it implies that the light is not inherent, but borrowed; and the force of the expression will be, 'He is the lamp that is kindled and so shineth.' Christ Himself is the centre and source of light; the Baptist has no light of his own, but draws all his illumination from this greater One. He is only as the light of the candle, for whose rays indeed men are grateful, but which is pale, flickering, transitory, compared with the glories of the Eternal flame from which itself is kindled.

3. After the tenses and the definite article, the *prepositions* deserve to be considered: for here also there is much room for improvement.

Of these διὰ holds the first place in importance: yet in dealing with this preposition we are met with a difficulty. The misunderstandings which arise in the mind of an English reader are due in most passages rather to the archaisms than to the errors of our translators: and archaisms are very intractable. Where in common language we now say 'by' and

Digitized by Google

'through' (*i.e.* 'by means of') respectively, our translators, following the diction of their age, generally use 'of' and 'by' respectively—'of' denoting the agent (ὑπό), and 'by' the instrument or means (διά). This however is not universally the case, but ὑπὸ is sometimes translated 'by' (e.g. Luke ii. 18) and διὰ sometimes 'through' (e.g. John i. 7). Such exceptions seem to show that the language was already in a state of transition: and this supposition is confirmed by observing that in the first passage Tyndale and the earlier Versions render τῶν λαληθέντων αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν ποιμένων 'those things which were told them *of* the shepherds'—a rendering still retained even in the Bishops' and Geneva Bibles, and first altered apparently by King James's revisers.

From these archaisms great ambiguity arises. When we hear 'It was said *of* him,' we understand at once '*about* or *concerning* him,' but this is not the meaning which this preposition bears in our New Testament. And again, when we read 'It was sent *by* me,' we understand 'I sent it,' but neither again is this the meaning intended. In the modern language 'by' represents the *sender* (ὑπό), whereas in the old it denotes the *bearer* (διά) of the letter or parcel. We do not venture to use '*by*,' meaning the intermediate agency or instrument, except in cases where the form or the matter of the sentence shows distinctly that the primary agent is not intended, so that no confusion is possible, as 'I sent it *by* him,' 'I was informed *by* telegraph.' Otherwise misunderstanding is in-

Digitized by Google

evitable. Thus in Acts xii. 9 'He wist not that it was true which was done *by* the angel' (*τὸ γινόμενον διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου*), or in Acts ii. 43 'Many words and signs were done *by* the Apostles' (*διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐγίνετο*), no English reader would suspect that the angel and the Apostles respectively are represented as the doers only in the sense in which a chisel may be said to carve a piece of wood, as instruments in the hands of an initiative power. In the same way Acts ii. 23 'Ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain' is, I fancy, wholly misunderstood: nor indeed would it be easy without a knowledge of the Greek, *διὰ χειρῶν ἀνόμων*[1], to discover that by the 'wicked hands,' or rather 'lawless hands,' is meant the instrumentality of the *ἄνομοι*, the heathen Romans, whom the Jews addressed by S. Peter had used as their tools to compass our Lord's death. And again, such renderings as Gal. iii. 19 'ordained by angels' (*διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων*), and Eph. iii. 10 'might be known by the Church (*γνωρισθῇ διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, i.e.* might be made known through the Church) the manifold wisdom of God,' are quite misleading. It was not however for the sake of such isolated examples as these that I entered upon this discussion. There are two very important *classes* of passages, in which the distinction between *ὑπὸ* (*ἀπό*) and *διὰ* is very important,

[1] I have taken *χειρῶν* as the reading which our translators had before them. But the correct text is unquestionably *διὰ χειρὸς ἀνόμων* 'by the hand of lawless men,' which brings out the sense still more clearly.

Digitized by Google

and in which therefore this ambiguity is much to be regretted.

The first of these has reference to *Inspiration.* Wherever the sacred writers have occasion to quote or to refer to the Old Testament, they invariably apply the preposition διά, as denoting *instrumentality,* to the lawgiver or the prophet or the psalmist, while they reserve ὑπό, as signifying the primary motive agency, to God Himself. This rule is, I believe, universal. Some few exceptions, it is true, occur in the received text; but all these vanish, when the readings of the older authorities are adopted[1]: and this very fact is significant, because it points to a contrast between the persistent idea of the sacred writers themselves and the comparative indifference of their later transcribers. Sometimes διὰ occurs alone, e.g. Matt. xxi. 4 τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου, xxiv. 15 τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιήλ, etc.; sometimes in close connexion with ὑπό, e.g. Matt. i. 22 τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ Κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου (comp. ii. 15). It is used moreover not only when the word is mentioned as *spoken,* but also

[1] In Matt. ii. 17, iii. 3, the readings of the received text are ὑπὸ Ἱερεμίου, ὑπὸ Ἡσαΐου respectively, but all the best critical editions read διά in both places, following the preponderance of ancient authority. In Matt. xxvii. 35, Mark xiii. 14, the clauses containing ὑπὸ in this connexion are interpolations, and are struck out in the best editions.

In all these four passages our A.V. has 'by,' though the translators had ὑπὸ in their text and (following their ordinary practice) should have rendered it 'of.' Tyndale, who led the way, probably having no distinct grammatical conception of the difference of ὑπὸ and διά, followed his theological instinct herein and thus extracted the right sense out of the false reading.

Digitized by Google

when it is mentioned as *written;* e.g. Matt. ii. 5 *οὕτω γὰρ γέγραπται διὰ τοῦ προφήτου,* Luke xviii. 31 *πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν.* Yet this significant fact is wholly lost to the English reader.

The other class of passages has a still more important theological bearing, having reference to the *Person of Christ.* The preposition, it is well known, which is especially applied to the Office of the Divine Word, is *διά*; e.g. Joh. i. 3, 10 *πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο... ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο,* 1 Cor. viii. 6 *εἷς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ,* Col. i. 16 *τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται,* Heb. i. 2 *δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας,* ii. 10 *δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα.* In all such passages the ambiguous 'by' is a serious obstacle to the understanding of the English reader. In the Nicene Creed itself the expression 'By whom (*δι' οὗ*) all things were made,' even when it is seen that the relative refers not to the Father but to the Son (and the accidental circumstance that the Father is mentioned just before misleads many persons on this point), yet fails to suggest any idea different from the other expression in the Creed 'Maker of Heaven and Earth,' which had before been applied to the Father. The perplexity and confusion are still further increased by the indistinct rendering, 'God *of* God, Light *of* Light,' etc. for *Θεὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, κ.τ.λ.*—words which in themselves represent the doctrine of God the Word as taught by S. John, but whose meaning is veiled by the English preposition *of.* Thus the Nicene

Digitized by Google

doctrine is obscured in the Nicene formula itself as represented to the English ear; and the prejudice against it, which is necessarily excited by misunderstanding, ensues. The same misconception must attend the corresponding passages in the New Testament; e.g. John i. 3, 10 'All things were made by Him,' 'The world was made by Him.' In this case it is much easier to point out the defect than to supply the remedy: but surely the English Version in this context is capricious in rendering *δι' αὐτοῦ* in the two passages already quoted '*by* Him,' and yet in an intermediate verse (7) translating *πάντες πιστεύσωσιν δι' αὐτοῦ* 'all men *through* him might believe,' and then again returning to *by* in ver. 17 *ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωυσέως ἐδόθη, ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο*, 'The law was given *by* Moses, but grace and truth came *by* Jesus Christ.' If prescription is too powerful to admit the rendering 'through' for *διὰ* throughout the passage, some degree of consistency at least might be attained, so that *πιστεύσωσιν δι' αὐτοῦ* and *διὰ Μωυσέως ἐδόθη* should be translated the same way.

But, though in the renderings of *διὰ* with the genitive we are confronted by archaisms rather than by errors, and it might be difficult and perhaps not advisable in many cases to meddle with them, the same apology and the same impediment do not apply to this preposition as used with the accusative. Here our translators are absolutely wrong, and a correction is imperative. Though they do not ever

Digitized by Google

(so far as I have noticed) translate διὰ with a genitive as though it had an accusative, they are frequently guilty of the converse error, and render it with an accusative as though it had a genitive. Thus Matt. xv. 3, 6 'Why do ye transgress the commandment of God?...ye have made the commandment of God of none effect *by* your tradition (*διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν*,' *i.e.* 'for the sake of your tradition,' or as it is expressed in the parallel passage Mark vii. 9, *ἵνα τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν τηρήσητε* [*στήσητε*]); John xv. 3 'Now ye are clean *through* the word (*διὰ τὸν λόγον*)'; Rom. ii. 24 'The name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles *through* you (*δι' ὑμᾶς*)'; 2 Cor. iv. 15 'That the abundant grace might *through* the thanksgiving of many redound to the glory of God (*ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσασα διὰ τῶν πλειόνων τὴν εὐχαριστίαν περισσεύσῃ εἰς τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Θεοῦ*),' where it is perhaps best to govern *τὴν εὐχαριστίαν* by *περισσεύσῃ* taken as a transitive, but where the English Version at all events has three positive errors, (1) translating *ἡ χάρις πλεονάσασα* as if *ἡ πλεονάσασα χάρις*, (2) rendering *τῶν πλειόνων* as if *πολλῶν*, (3) giving the wrong sense to *διὰ* with the accusative; Heb. vi. 7 'Bringeth forth herbs meet for them *by* whom it is dressed (*δι' οὓς γεωργεῖται*).' Yet in Rom. viii. 11, 'He shall also quicken your mortal bodies *by* his Spirit that dwelleth in you,' our translators were apparently alive to the difference of signification in the various readings *διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος...πνεύματος* and *διὰ τὸ ἐνοικοῦν...πνεῦμα*, for they add in the margin '*Or*, because of his Spirit.'

Digitized by Google

In translating the other prepositions also there is occasional laxity. Thus *ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν* is rendered '*in* the clouds' (Matt. xxiv. 30, xxvi. 64), though the imagery is marred thereby, and though the mention of 'Him that sat *on* the cloud (*ἐπὶ τῆς νεφέλης*)' in the Apocalypse (xiv. 15, 16) ought to have ensured the correct translation. And similarly in Matt. iv. 6, Luke iv. 10, the English rendering '*In* their hands they shall bear thee up' presents a different picture from the *ἐπὶ χειρῶν* of the original[1]. Again the proper force of *εἰς* is often sacrificed, where the loss is not inappreciable. Thus in 2 Cor. xi. 3, *οὕτω φθαρῇ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἁπλότητος τῆς εἰς τὸν Χριστόν* is rendered 'So your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is *in* Christ,' where the true idea is 'sincerity or fidelity *towards* Christ,' in accordance with the image in the context, 'That I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ.' Even more serious is the injury done to the sense in 1 Cor. viii. 6, *ἀλλ'*

[1] In Mark xii. 26 *οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ Μωϋσέως ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου, πῶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Θεός* 'Have ye not read in the book of Moses how *in the bush* God spake unto him?' the wrong idea conveyed in the English Version arises more from neglect of the order than from mistranslation of the preposition. If the order of the original had been trusted, our translators would have seen that *ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου* must mean 'in the passage relating to the Bush,' 'in the passage called the Bush' (comp. *ἐν Ἠλίᾳ* Rom. xi. 2, 'in the history of Elijah,' where again our A. V. has the wrong rendering '*of* Elias'). Strangely enough Wycliffe alone of our English translators gives the right meaning, 'Han ye not rad in the book of Moises on the bousche, how God seide to him?' In the parallel passage Luke xx. 37 the rendering of our Authorised Version 'at the bush' is at all events an improvement on the preceding translations 'besides the bush.'

Digitized by Google

ἡμῖν εἷς Θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἷς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ, where the studiously careful distribution of the prepositions in the original is entirely deranged by rendering εἰς αὐτόν '*in* him' instead of '*unto* him,' though here a marginal alternative '*for* him' is given.

Again a common form of error is the mistranslation of βαπτίζειν εἰς, as in 1 Cor. i. 13 'Or were ye baptized *in* the name of Paul (εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Παύλου)?' So again Matt. xxviii. 19, Acts viii. 16. In Acts xix. 3, 5, after being twice given correctly '*Unto* what then were ye baptized? And they said *unto* John's baptism,' nevertheless when it occurs a third time it is wrongly translated, 'When they heard this, they were baptized *in* the name (εἰς τὸ ὄνομα) of the Lord Jesus.' On the other hand in Rom. vi. 3, 1 Cor. x. 2, xii. 13, Gal. iii. 27, the preposition is duly respected.

Again, though the influence of the Hebrew and Aramaic has affected the use of ἐν, so that it cannot be measured by a strictly classical standard, still the license which our Version occasionally takes is quite unjustifiable. In such passages as Rom. xiv. 14 οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ 'I know and am persuaded *by* the Lord Jesus,' 1 Cor. xii. 13 καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἑνὶ Πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν 'For *by* one Spirit are we all baptized into one body,' the Hebraic or instrumental sense of ἐν is indefensible.

Lastly, even prepositions with such well-defined

Digitized by Google

meanings as *ἀπὸ* and *ὑπέρ* are not always respected; as for example in 2 Thess. ii. 1, 2 'Now we beseech you, brethren, *by* (*ὑπέρ*) the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ and *by* our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken *in* mind (*ἀπὸ τοῦ νοός*)'; while elsewhere *παρὰ* is similarly illtreated, 1 Pet. ii. 4 'Disallowed indeed of men (*ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων*), but chosen *of* God (*παρὰ Θεῷ ἐκλεκτόν*).'

Under these three heads the most numerous grammatical errors of our Version fall. But other inaccuracies of diverse kinds confront us from time to time, and some of these are of real importance. Any one who attempts to frame a system of the chronology of our Lord's life by a comparison of the Gospel-narratives with one another and with contemporary Jewish history, will know how perplexing is the statement in our English Version of Luke iii. 23 that Jesus after His baptism '*began to be* about thirty years of age.' But the original need not and (in fact) cannot mean this; for *ἦν ἀρχόμενος ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα* must be translated 'was about thirty years old, *when he began*' (*i.e.* at the commencement of His public life, His ministry); where *ὡσεὶ* is sufficiently elastic to allow a year or two or even more either under or *over* the thirty years: and in fact the notices of Herod's life in Josephus compared with S. Matthew's narrative seem to require that our Lord should have been somewhat *more* than thirty years old at the time. Again such a translation as Phil. iv. 3 *συνλαμβάνου αὐταῖς αἵτινες*...

Digitized by Google

συνήθλησάν μοι, 'Help *those women which* laboured with me,' is impossible; and, going hand in hand with an error in the preceding verse by which a man 'Euodias' is substituted for a woman 'Euodia[1],' calls for correction. Again in 2 Pet. iii. 12 the rendering of *σπεύδοντας τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας* 'hasting unto the coming of the day of God' cannot stand, and the alternative suggested in the margin 'hasting the coming' should be placed in the text; for the words obviously imply that the zeal and steadfastness of the faithful will be instrumental in speeding the final crisis. Again the substitution of an interrogative for a relative in Matt. xxvi. 50 *ἑταῖρε, ἐφ' ὃ πάρει*, 'Friend, wherefore art thou come?' is not warranted by New Testament usage, though here our translators are supported by many modern commentators; and the expression must be treated as an aposiopesis, 'Friend, *do that* for which thou art come[2].' Again our translators have on more than one occasion indulged in the grammatical fiction of *Hypallage*, rendering *πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας* 'for the use of edifying' in Eph. iv. 29, and *ἀφέντες τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον* (Heb. vi. 1) 'leav-

[1] The Versions of Tyndale and Coverdale, the Great Bible, and the Bishops' Bible, treat both as men's names, Euodias and Syntiches (Syntyches or Sintiches); the Geneva Testament (1557) gives both correctly; but the Geneva Bible takes up the intermediate position, and is followed by our A. V. All alike are wrong in the translation of *αὐταῖς αἴτινες*.

[2] Thus it may be compared with John xiii. 27 *ὃ ποιεῖς, ποίησον τάχιον*.

Digitized by Google

ing the principles of the doctrine of Christ.' In both of these passages however there is a marginal note, though in the first the alternative offered 'to edify profitably' slurs over the difficulty. Such grammatical deformities as these should be swept away. Neither again should we tolerate such a rendering as 1 Cor. xii. 28 *ἀντιλήμψεις, κυβερνήσεις*, 'helps *in* governments[1],' where the original contemplates two distinct functions, of which *ἀντιλήμψεις* would apply mainly to the diaconate and *κυβερνήσεις* to the presbytery, but where our translators have had recourse to the grammatical fiction of *Hendiadys*. A somewhat similar instance to the last, where two detached words are combined in defiance of the sense, is 1 Cor. xvi. 22 'Let him be Anathema Maranatha,' where doubtless the words should be separated; *ἤτω ἀνάθεμα· Μαρὰν ἀθά*, 'Let him be anathema. Maran Atha' (*i.e.* 'The Lord cometh,' or 'is come').

Isolated examples of grammatical inaccuracy such as these might be multiplied; but I will close with one illustration, drawn from the treatment of the word *φαίνειν*. The distinction between *φαίνειν* 'to shine' and *φαίνεσθαι* 'to appear' is based on an elementary principle of grammar. It is therefore surprising that our translators should not have observed the difference. And yet, though the context

[1] This is the rendering in the edition of 1611; but the preposition was struck out in the Cambridge edition of 1637 (and possibly earlier), and the text is commonly printed 'helps, governments,' but without any authority.

Digitized by Google

in most cases leads them right, the errors of which they are guilty in particular passages show that they proceeded on no fixed principle. Thus we have in Acts xxvii. 20 *μήτε ἄστρων ἐπιφαινόντων ἐπὶ πλείονας ἡμέρας* 'Nor stars in many days *appeared*,' and conversely in Matt. xxiv. 27 *καὶ φαίνεται ἕως δυσμῶν* 'And *shineth* even unto the west,' and in Phil. ii. 15 *ἐν οἷς φαίνεσθε ὡς φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ* 'Among whom ye *shine* as lights in the world,' (where the marginal alternative of an imperative 'shine ye' is given, but no misgiving seems to have been suggested to our translators by the voice of *φαίνεσθε*[1]). When they have gone so far wrong in a simple matter of inflexion, it is not surprising that syntactic considerations should have been overlooked, and that they should not have recognised the proper distinction between *φαίνομαι εἶναι* 'I appear to be,' and *φαίνομαι ὤν* 'I am seen to be.' Of this error they are guilty in Matt. vi. 16, 18, *ὅπως φανῶσιν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις νηστεύοντες, ὅπως μὴ φανῇς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις νηστεύων*, 'That they may appear unto men to fast,' 'That thou appear not unto men to fast'; though the sense is correctly given by Tyndale (with whom most of the older Versions

[1] Again in Rev. xviii. 23 *φῶς λύχνου οὐ μὴ φανῇ ἐν σοὶ ἔτι*, if the word was accentuated as a passive (*φανῇ*) in the text used by our translators, as was probably the case, they have rendered it incorrectly 'The light of the candle shall *shine* no more in thee'; but here Lachmann and others read the active *φάνῃ*. In Rev. viii. 12 they read *φαίνῃ* and rightly translated it 'shone': but modern critical editors substitute *φάνῃ* or *φανῇ*. In Acts xxi. 3 'When we had discovered Cyprus,' the correct text is probably *ἀναφανέντες δὲ τὴν Κύπρον*, but 'discovered' seems to be intended as a translation of the other reading *ἀναφάναντες*.

Digitized by Google

agree substantially), 'That they might be seen of men how they fast,' 'That it appear not unto men how that thou fastest.'

The directly opposite fault to that which has just been discussed also deserves notice, and may perhaps be considered here. If hitherto attention has been directed to the ignorance or disregard of Greek grammar in our translators, it may be well to point out instances in which they have attempted to improve the original, where the connexion is loose or the structure ungrammatical. This happens most frequently where past and present tenses are intermingled in the original; e.g. Matt. iii. 15, 16 *ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν...τότε ἀφίησιν αὐτόν...καὶ βαπτισθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέβη*, where for the sake of symmetry *ἀφίησιν* is translated *suffered*; or Mark xiv. 53, 54 *καὶ ἀπήγαγον τὸν Ἰησοῦν...καὶ συνέρχονται αὐτῷ πάντες...καὶ ὁ Πετρὸς ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ*, where for the same reason *συνέρχονται* is given *were assembled*. In all such cases there is no good reason for departing from the original. This is not a question of the idiom in different languages, but of the style of a particular author; and peculiarities of style should, as far as possible, be reproduced. Moreover our translators themselves have not ventured always to reduce the tenses to uniformity, so that the licence they have taken results in capricious alterations here and there, which serve no worthy purpose.

Digitized by Google

These however are nothing more than loosenesses of style. But even grammatical inaccuracies ought to be preserved, as far as possible; for it will generally be found that in such cases the grammar is sacrificed to some higher end—either greater force of expression or greater clearness of meaning. More than one instance of this occurs in the Apocalypse. In the letters to the Seven Churches the messages close with words of encouragement to the victor in the struggle. In the last four of these the words *ὁ νικῶν* are flung out at the beginning of the sentence without any regard to the subsequent construction, which in three out of the four is changed so that the nominative stands alone without any government: ii. 26 *καὶ ὁ νικῶν.....δώσω αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν*, iii. 12 *ὁ νικῶν, ποιήσω αὐτὸν στύλον*, iii. 21 *ὁ νικῶν, δώσω αὐτῷ καθίσαι.* In the first instance only have our translators had the courage to retain the broken grammar of the original, 'And *he* that overcometh... *to him* will I give,' acting thus boldly perhaps because the intervening words partly obscure the irregularity. In the other two cases they have set the grammar straight; 'Him that overcometh will I make a pillar,' 'To him that overcometh will I grant to sit.' Yet there was no sufficient reason for making a difference, and in all alike the English should have commenced as the Greek commences, 'He that overcometh.'

Would it be thought overbold if I were to counsel the same scrupulous adherence to the form of the

Digitized by Google

original in a still more important passage? In Rev. i. 4 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ [τοῦ] ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, the defiance of grammar is even more startling. It may be true that a cultivated Athenian could hardly have brought himself to write thus; but certainly the fisherman of Galilee did not so express himself from mere ignorance of Greek, for such ignorance as this supposition would assume must have prevented his writing the Apocalypse at all. In this instance at least, where the Apostle is dealing with the Name of names, the motive which would lead him to isolate the words from their context is plain enough. And should not this remarkable feature be preserved in our English Bible? If in Exod. iii. 14 the words run 'I AM hath sent me unto you,' may we not also be allowed to read here, 'from HE THAT IS AND THAT WAS AND THAT IS TO COME'? Certainly the violation of grammar would not be greater in the English than it is in the Greek.

§ 5.

If the errors of grammar in our English Version are very numerous, those of *lexicography* are not so frequent. Yet even here several indisputable errors need correction; not a few doubtful interpretations may be improved; and many vague renderings will gain by being made sharper and clearer.

Digitized by Google

Instances of *impossible* renderings occur from time to time, though the whole number of these is not great. By impossible renderings I mean those cases in which our translators have assigned to a word a signification which it never bears elsewhere, and which therefore we must at once discard without considering whether it does or does not harmonize with the context.

Such for instance is the treatment of the particles ἔτι and ἤδη in occasional passages, where their meaning is interchanged in our Version; as in Mark xiii. 28 ὅταν αὐτῆς ἤδη ὁ κλάδος ἁπαλὸς γένηται κ.τ.λ. 'When her branch is *yet* tender,' for 'As soon as its branch is tender' (the sign of approaching summer), and 2 Cor. i. 23 οὐκέτι ἦλθον εἰς Κόρινθον, 'I came *not as yet* unto Corinth,' for 'I came *no more* unto Corinth' (I paid no fresh visit): or the rendering of ἅπαξ in Heb. xii. 26 ἔτι ἅπαξ ἐγὼ σείω, 'Yet *once more* I shake': or of καὶ γάρ in Matt. xv. 27 ναί, Κύριε, καὶ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει, 'Truth, Lord, *yet* the dogs eat.' And, when we turn from particles to nouns and verbs, examples will not fail us. Such are the renderings of ἀνεψιὸς in Col. iv. 10 'Marcus, *sister's son* to Barnabas' (ὁ ἀνεψιὸς Βαρνάβα) for *cousin*: of φθινοπωρινὸς in Jude 12 'Trees *whose fruit withereth*, without fruit (δένδρα φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα), twice dead, plucked up by the roots,' for '*autumn* trees without fruit, etc.', where there appears to be a reference to the parable of the barren fig-tree (Luke xiii. 6), and where at all events the mention of the season

Digitized by Google

when fruit might be expected is significant[1], while under any circumstances the awkward contradiction of terms in our English Version should have suggested some misgiving: of θριαμβεύειν in 2 Cor. ii. 14 'God which always *causeth us to triumph* (τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς) in Christ,' for 'leadeth us in triumph,' where the image of the believer made captive and chained to the car of Christ is most expressive, while the paradox of the Apostle's thanksgiving over his own spiritual defeat and thraldom is at once forcible and characteristic: and of πάρεσις in Rom. iii. 25 'To declare his righteousness *for the remission* of past sins (διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων),' for '*by reason of the passing over* of the former sins,' where the double error of mistranslating διὰ and of giving πάρεσις the sense of ἄφεσις has entirely shattered the meaning, and where the context

[1] Strange to say, the earliest Versions all rendered φθινοπωρινὰ correctly. Tyndale's instinct led him to give what I cannot but think the right turn to the expression; 'Trees with out frute at gadringe [gathering] time,' *i.e.* at the season when fruit was looked for; I cannot agree with Abp. Trench (p. 125), who maintains that 'Tyndale was feeling after, though he has not grasped, the right translation', and himself explains φθινοπωρινά, ἄκαρπα, as 'mutually completing one another,' *without leaves, without fruit.* Tyndale was followed by Coverdale and the Great Bible. Similarly Wycliffe has 'hervest trees without fruyt,' and the Rheims Version 'Trees of Autumne, unfruiteful'. The earliest offender is the Geneva Testament which gives 'corrupt trees and without frute,' a rendering adopted also in the Geneva Bible. The Bishops' Bible strangely combines both renderings, 'trees withered [φθίνειν] at fruite geathering [ὀπώρα] and without fruite'; which is explained in the margin 'Trees withered in Autumne when the fruite harvest is, and so the Greke woord importeth', while at the same time other alternative interpretations are given.

Digitized by Google

implies that this signal manifestation of God's righteousness was vouchsafed, not because the sins were forgiven, but because they were only overlooked for the time without being forgiven[1]. Other examples again are συλαγωγεῖν in Col. ii. 8 μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν 'Lest any man spoil you,' for '*make spoil* of you,' '*carry* you *off as plunder*': προβιβάζειν in Matt. xiv. 8 προβιβασθεῖσα ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς, 'Being *before instructed* by her mother,' for 'being *put forward*, urged, by her mother,' for there is no instance of the temporal sense of the preposition in this compound: ἐπερώτημα in 1 Pet. iii. 21 'The *answer* of a good conscience toward God,' for 'the *question*,' where the word may mean a *petition* but certainly cannot mean an *answer*: δικαιώματα in Rom. ii. 26 'If the circumcision keep the *righteousness* of the law,' for 'the *ordinances* of the law': πωροῦν, πώρωσις, in the Epistles (Rom. xi. 7, 25, 2 Cor. iii. 14, Eph. iv. 18), where they are always rendered 'blind, blindness,' though correctly translated in the Gospels (Mark iii. 5, vi. 52, John xii. 40) 'harden, hardness[2].'

[1] An alternative sense of πάρεσιν is given in the margin, '*or* passing over'; but this is not sufficient to elicit the right meaning without also correcting the rendering of διά.

[2] This illustrates the incongruity which results from assigning different parts of the New Testament to different persons. In the instance before us however a compromise is effected by marginal alternatives. In Mark iii. 5 the margin has '*or* blindness'; in Rom. xi. 7, 25, Eph. iv. 18, '*or* hardened', '*or* hardness'. In the other passages there is no margin in the edition of 1611.

Digitized by Google

In some cases the wrong rendering of our translators arose from a false derivation, which was generally accepted in their age. Thus *ἀκέραιος* is rendered 'harmless' (from *κέρας*, *κεραΐζω*) Matt. x. 16, Phil. ii. 15, instead of 'simple, pure, sincere,' (from *κεράννυμι* 'to mix, adulterate'), though in Rom. xvi. 19 it is correctly given[1]. So also *ἐριθεία* is taken to mean 'strife, contention' (Rom. ii. 8, 2 Cor. xii. 20, Gal. v. 20, Phil. i. 17, ii. 3, James iii. 14, 16) from its supposed connexion with *ἔρις*; whereas its true derivation is from *ἔριθος* 'a hired partisan', so that it denotes 'party-spirit'. And again in Jude 12 *οὗτοί εἰσιν ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες* 'These are *spots* in your feasts of charity', *σπιλάδες* 'rocks' is translated as if *σπῖλοι* 'spots'[2]; our translators having

[1] In Matt. x. 16 however the margin has '*or* simple', and in Phil. ii. 15 '*or* sincere.'

[2] At least this is the view taken by modern commentators almost universally; but it does not seem to me certain that *σπιλάδες* here cannot mean 'spots'; for (1) All the early Versions connect it with this root, translating it either as a substantive 'stains', or as an adjective 'polluted'. This is the case with the Old and the Revised Latin, with both the Egyptian Versions, and with the Philoxenian Syriac, nor have I noticed a single one which renders it 'rocks'. (2) As *σπῖλος* (or *σπίλος*), which generally signifies a 'spot' or 'stain', sometimes has the sense 'a rock', so conversely it is quite possible that *σπιλάς* 'a rock' should occasionally exchange its ordinary meaning for that of *σπῖλος*. (3) In one of the Orphic poems, *Lith.* 614 *κατάστικτον σπιλάδεσσι πυρσῇσιν λευκαῖς τε μελαινομέναις χλοεραῖς τε*, it has this sense; and, though this poem was apparently not written till the fourth century, still it seems highly improbable that the writer should have derived this sense of the word solely from S. Jude. If he did so, it only shows how fixed this interpretation had become before his time. (4) The extreme violence of the metaphor 'rocks in your feasts of charity' is certainly not

Digitized by Google

doubtless been influenced by the parallel passage 2 Pet. ii. 13 σπῖλοι καὶ μῶμοι ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν, 'Spots are they and blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings[1].' The last example of this class of errors, which I shall take, is the surname of Simon the Apostle, 'the Canaanite.' The correct form of the word is Καναναῖος, not Κανανίτης, in both passages where it occurs (Matt. x. 4, Mark iii. 18); but the latter stood in the text which our translators had before them. Yet this false reading certainly should not have misled them; for Χαναναῖος, the word for the Canaanite in the LXX and in Matt. xv. 22, is even farther from Κανανίτης than from Καναναῖος. The parallel passages in S. Luke (Luke vi. 15, Acts i. 13) point to the fact that this surname is the Aramaic word Kanan, קנאן, corresponding to the Greek ζηλωτής 'the Zealot[2]'; and this being so, it is

favourable to the interpretation which it is proposed to substitute. And (5) though this argument must not be pressed, yet the occurrence of σπῖλοι καὶ μῶμοι in the parallel passage (2 Pet. ii. 13) must be allowed some weight in determining the sense of σπιλάδες here.

[1] I have quoted the passage as it stands in the received text ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις, but ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις is read by Lachmann and Tregelles, as in Jude 12.

[2] See Ewald *Gesch. des V. Isr.* v. p. 322, Derembourg *L'Histoire de la Palestine* p. 238. This is a common termination of names of sects when Grecized; e. g. Ἀσσιδαῖος, Φαρισαῖος, Σαδδουκαῖος, Ἐσσαῖος (Hegesipp. in Euseb. *H.E.* iv. 23). This fact seems to have escaped Meyer when he points to the termination as showing that Καναναῖος denotes the name of a place and thus exhibits a false tradition, while the true account is preserved in the ζηλωτής of S. Luke. Indeed the formation of Καναναῖος from Kanan is exactly analogous to that of Φαρισαῖος from Pharish or Ἀσσιδαῖος from Hhasid. Meyer confesses himself at a loss to name any place to which he can refer Καναναῖος.

Digitized by Google

somewhat strange that our translators should have gone astray on the word, seeing that the Greek form for כנעני 'Canaanite' is invariably spelt correctly with a X corresponding to *Caph*, and not with a K corresponding to *Koph*. The earlier Versions however all suppose the word to involve the name of a place, though they do not all render it alike. Tyndale, Coverdale, and the Great Bible have 'Simon of Cane' or 'Cana'; the Geneva Testament (1557) has 'of Canan' in the one place, and 'of Cane' in the other; the Geneva Bible 'Cananite' in both. The Bishops' Bible, so far as I have observed, first prints the word with a double *a* (Matt. x. 4), thus fixing the reference to Canaan[1].

In the Peshito, Καναναῖος is translated ܩܢܢܝܐ, but Χαναναῖος ܟܢܢܝܐ, where the difference of the initial letter and the insertion of the ܟ in the latter word show that in this Version the forms were not confounded.

[1] To this list of false derivations some would add κατάνυξις in Rom. xi. 8, where πνεῦμα κατανύξεως is rendered 'the spirit of *slumber*', though with the marginal alternative *remorse;* but I doubt whether Abp. Trench is right in saying (p. 118) that 'our translators must have derived κατάνυξις from νυστάζειν, as many others have done.' The fact is that κατανύσσειν, κατάνυξις, are frequently used in the LXX to translate words denoting heavy sleep, silence, amazement, and the like, e.g. Levit. x. 3, Ps. iv. 5, xxx. 13, xxxv. 15, Is. vi. 5, Dan. x. 9; and in the very passage to which S. Paul here refers, Is. xxix. 10, κατάνυξις represents the Hebrew תרדמה 'deep sleep'. The idea of *numbness* is the connecting link between *pricking*, *wounding*, and *stupor*, *heavy sleep*. Fritzsche (*Rom.* II. p. 558 sq.) has an important excursus on the word, but is not always happy in his explanation of the LXX renderings. The earlier English Versions generally adopted the more literal meaning of κατάνυξις. Thus Wycliffe and the Rheims Version have 'compunction' after the Vulgate; Tyndale, Coverdale, and the Great Bible 'unquietness'; the Bishops' Bible 'remorse', with the marginal note 'That is,

Digitized by Google

There are other passages where, though the word itself will admit the meaning assigned to it in our Version, and so this meaning cannot be called impossible, yet the context more or less decidedly favours another sense. Examples belonging to this class are James iii. 5 *ἰδοὺ ὀλίγον* [l. *ἡλίκον*] *πῦρ ἡλίκην ὕλην ἀνάπτει*, 'Behold how great a *matter* a little fire kindleth,' where the literal meaning of *ὕλη* is certainly to be preferred to the philosophical, and where it is most strange that our translators having the correct word 'wood' present to their minds should have banished it to the margin: Matt. xxvi. 15 *ἔστησαν αὐτῷ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια*, 'They *covenanted with him for* thirty pieces of silver,' where the passage in Zechariah (xi. 12 'They *weighed* for my price thirty pieces of silver,' LXX *ἔστησαν*) to which the Evangelist alludes ought to have led to the proper rendering of the same word here, '*weighed* unto him': Heb. ii. 16 *οὐ γὰρ δήπου ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ ἐπιλαμβάνεται*, 'He *took not on him the nature of* angels, but *he took on him* the seed of Abraham,' where the context suggests the more natural meaning of *ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι* 'To take hold of for the purpose of supporting or assisting' (comp. ver. 18 *βοηθῆσαι*); Mark iv. 29 *ὅταν παραδοῖ ὁ καρπός*,

pricking and unquietnesse of conscience'. The Geneva Testament (1557) is as usual the innovator, rendering the word 'heavy sleep'. For this the Geneva Bible substitutes 'slumber', but with a margin '*or* pricking'.

The reasons why I do not class *ἐπιούσιος* among these words, in which a mistaken derivation has led to a wrong translation, will be given in the Appendix.

Digitized by Google

'When the fruit is *brought forth*,' where the right meaning *ripe* is given in the margin: Acts ii. 3 διαμεριζόμεναι γλῶσσαι ὡσεὶ πυρός, 'Cloven tongues as of fire,' where the imagery and the symbolism, not less than the tense, suggest a different rendering of διαμεριζόμεναι, *parting asunder*: 2 Cor. iv. 4 εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγάσαι [αὐτοῖς] τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 'Lest the light of the Gospel...*should shine* unto them,' where indeed the fault was not with the translators but with the reading, since having αὐτοῖς in their text they had no choice but to translate the words so; but when αὐτοῖς is struck out (as it should be), a different sense ought perhaps to be given to αὐγάσαι, 'That they might not *behold* the light,' etc. Another and a very important example of this class of errors is the rendering of παῖς in Acts iii. 13, 26, iv. 27, 30, where it is translated 'son' or 'child' in place of 'servant', thus obliterating the connexion with the prophetic announcement of the 'servant of the Lord' in Isaiah[1]. It is not here, as elsewhere, the Sonship, but the ministry, on which the Apostles dwell. In Matt. xii. 18, where the prophecy itself (Isai. xlii. 1) is quoted and applied to our Lord, the words are rightly translated, 'Behold I send my *servant*'; and indeed when confronted with the original no one would think of rendering it otherwise. Other instances again are the rendering of αἴρειν in John i. 29 ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, 'Which *taketh away* the sin of the world,'

[1] See especially Trench *Authorized Version*, p. 69.

Digitized by Google

where the marginal reading *beareth* should probably be substituted in the text; and similarly of *ἀνενεγκεῖν* in Heb. ix. 28, 1 Pet. ii. 24 *ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας*, 'To *bear* the sins,' where the true idea is not that of sustaining a burden, but of raising upon the cross. So again *πεπληροφορημένων* in Luke i. 1 probably means 'fulfilled' rather than 'most surely believed,' as in the latter sense the passive is used only of the persons convinced and not of the things credited. On the other hand, it is not certain whether *βαστάζειν* means 'to carry off, to steal' in John xii. 6 *τὰ βαλλόμενα ἐβάσταζεν*, or whether the English Version '*bare* what was put therein' should stand.

In another class of words the English rendering, while it cannot be called incorrect, is vague or inadequate, so that the exact idea of the original is not represented or the sharpness of outline is blurred. This defect will be most obvious in metaphors. For instance in Rom. vi. 13, where *ὅπλα ἀδικίας* is rendered '*instruments* of unrighteousness,' instead of *arms* or *weapons* (which however is given as an alternative in the margin), we fail to recognise the image of military service rendered to Sin, as a great king (ver. 12 *μὴ βασιλευέτω*) who enforces obedience (*ὑπακούειν*) and pays his soldiery in the coin of death (ver. 23 *τὰ ὀψώνια τῆς ἁμαρτίας θάνατος*). Again the rendering of Col. ii. 5 *ὑμῶν τὴν τάξιν καὶ τὸ στερέωμα τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως ὑμῶν*, 'Your order and the stedfastness of your faith in Christ,' fails to suggest the idea of the close phalanx arrayed for battle, which

Digitized by Google

is involved in the original[1]: and similarly in 2 Cor. x. 5 *πᾶν ὕψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ* our translators in rendering the words 'Every *high thing that exalteth itself* against the knowledge of God,' appear not to have seen that this expression continues the metaphor of the campaign (*στρατευόμεθα*) and the fortresses (*ὀχυρώματα*) in the context, and that the reference is to the siege works *thrown up* for the purpose of attacking the faith. Again the metaphor of *καταναρκᾶν* is very inadequately given in 2 Cor. xi. 9 'I was *chargeable to* no man,' and in xii. 13, 14 'I was not, I will not be, *burdensome to* any one': and the '*thorn* in the flesh' in the English Version of 2 Cor. xii. 7 has suggested interpretations of S. Paul's malady, which the original *σκόλοψ* 'a *stake*' does not countenance, and is almost as wide of the mark as the Latin *stimulus carnis* which also has led to much misunderstanding. These are a few instances out of many, which might be given, where a metaphor has suffered from inadequate rendering.

Other examples also, where no metaphor is involved, might be multiplied. Thus in Matt. ix. 16, Mark ii. 21, it is difficult to see why our translators should have abandoned the natural expression 'undressed cloth,' which occurs in the Geneva Testament, as a rendering of *ῥάκος ἄγναφον*, for 'new cloth,' contenting themselves with putting 'raw *or*

[1] 1 Macc. ix. 14 *εἶδεν Ἰούδας ὅτι Βακχίδης καὶ τὸ στερέωμα τῆς παρεμβολῆς ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς.*

Digitized by Google

unwrought' in the margin. In Matt. xxvi. 36, Mark xiv. 32, we read in the English Version of 'a *place* called Gethsemane'; the Greek however is not χῶρος but χωρίον, not a place but 'a parcel of ground' (as it is rendered in John iv. 5), an enclosure, a field or garden, and thus corresponds more closely to κῆπος by which S. John describes the same locality though without mentioning the name (xviii. 1). In Acts i. 3 ὀπτανόμενος αὐτοῖς should not have been translated 'being *seen of* them,' for the emphatic word ὀπτάνεσθαι, which does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, expresses much more than this, and '*showing himself unto* them' would be a better though still an inadequate rendering. In Rom. ii. 22 ὁ βδελυσσόμενος τὰ εἴδωλα ἱεροσυλεῖς the inconsistency of the man who *plunders a heathen temple* while professing to loathe an idol, is lost by the rendering 'dost thou *commit sacrilege*'; and indeed it may be suspected that our translators misapprehended the force of ἱεροσυλεῖς, more especially as in most of the earlier Versions it was translated 'robbest God of his honour.' In Acts xiv. 13 'Then the priest of Jupiter which was before the city, brought oxen and garlands unto the gates,' the English reader inevitably thinks of the city-gates; but as the Greek has πυλῶνας, not πύλας, the portal or gateway or vestibule of the temple is clearly meant. This was seen by Tyndale, who quaintly translates it 'the church-porch.' In Acts xvii. 29, S. Paul addressing an audience of heathen philosophers condescends to adopt the lan-

Digitized by Google

guage familiar to them, and speaks of *τὸ θεῖον*—an expression which does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament; but in the English rendering 'Godhead' this vague philosophical term becomes concrete and precise, as though it had been *θεότης* in the original. In the Acts xiii. 50 and elsewhere *οἱ σεβόμενοι, αἱ σεβόμεναι,* by which S. Luke always means 'proselytes, worshippers of the one God,' are translated 'devout'; and hence the strange statement (which must perplex many an English reader) that 'the Jews stirred up the devout and honourable women....and raised persecution against Paul and Barnabas.' In 2 Cor. xiii. 11 *καταρτίζεσθε* is rendered 'be *perfect*,' and in the 9th verse *τὴν ὑμῶν κατάρτισιν* 'your *perfection*,' but the context shows that in these parting injunctions S. Paul reiterates the leading thought of the Epistles, exhorting the Corinthians to *compose their differences:* and this is the meaning of 1 Cor. i. 10 *ἦτε δὲ κατηρτισμένοι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοΐ*, where it is better rendered 'that ye be *perfectly joined together*, etc.' Lastly, in 1 Tim. iii. 3, Tit. i. 7, *μὴ πάροινον* is translated 'not given to wine'; but in the first passage this idea is already expressed by *νηφάλιον,* and natural as the more obvious rendering might seem, the usage of *πάροινος* elsewhere shows that it denotes 'a brawler,' 'a *quarrelsome* person' (which is the alternative meaning offered in the margin).

I will close this section with an illustration, of which it is difficult to say whether we should more

Digitized by Google

properly class it under the head of lexicography or of grammar. Σάββατα is the Aramaic form of the Hebrew word for 'a sabbath' written out in Greek letters. Appearing in this form, it is naturally declined as a plural *σάββατα, σαββάτων*, but nevertheless retains its proper meaning as a singular. How widely this form was known, and how strictly it preserved its force as a singular, will appear from Horace's 'Hodie tricesima sabbata.' In our Version of the New Testament, whenever the meaning is unmistakable it is translated as a singular (e.g. Matt. xii. 1, 11, Mark i. 21, ii. 23, iii. 2, Acts xiii. 14); but where the sense is doubtful a plural rendering is mostly preferred (e.g. Matt. xii. 5, 10, 12, Mark iii. 4). In all these cases however it is much better treated as a singular, in accordance with the sense which it bears in the same contexts; and in such a passage as Col. ii. 16 *ἐν μέρει ἑορτῆς ἢ νεομηνίας ἢ σαββάτων*, the plural 'sabbath-days' is obviously out of place, as co-ordinated with two singular nouns. The only passage in the New Testament where *σάββατα* is distinctly plural is Acts xvii. 2 *ἐπὶ σάββατα τρία*, where it is defined by the numeral.

§ 6.

Over and above the ordinary questions of translation, there is a particular class of words which presents special difficulties and needs special atten-

Digitized by Google

tion. Proper names, official titles, technical terms, which, as belonging to one language and one nation, have no direct equivalents in another, must obviously be treated in an exceptional way. Are they to be reproduced as they stand in the original, or is the translator to give the terms most nearly corresponding to them in the language of his version? Is he to adopt the policy of despair, or the policy of compromise? Or may he invoke either principle according to the exigencies of the case? and, if so, what laws can be laid down to regulate his practice and to prevent caprice?

Of this class of words, *proper names* are the least difficult to deal with; and yet even these occasionally offer perplexing problems.

The general principles, on which our translators proceeded in this matter, are twofold. *First*; where no familiar English form of a name existed, they retained the form substantially as they found it. In other words they reproduced the Hebrew or Chaldee form in the Old Testament, and the Greek in the New. *Secondly*; where a proper name had been adopted into the English language and become naturalised there with some modification of form, or where the person or place was commonly known in English by a name derived from some other language, they adopted this English equivalent, however originated. Instances of English equivalents arrived at by the one process are, Eve, Herod, James, John, Jude, Luke, Magdalene, Mary, Peter, Pilate, Saul, Stephen,

Digitized by Google

Zebedee, Italy, Rome, etc.: of the other, Assyria, Ethiopia, Euphrates, Idumea, Mesopotamia, Persia, Syria, etc., Artaxerxes, Cyrus, Darius, etc., for Asshur, Cush, Phrath, Edom, Aram-Naharaim, Pharas, Aram, etc., Arta-chshashta, Coresh, Daryavesh, etc., in the Old Testament[1], the more familiar classical forms being substituted for the less familiar Hebrew; and of Diana, Jupiter, Mercurius, for Artemis, Zeus, Hermes, in the New—the more familiar Latin being substituted for the less familiar Greek: while in some few cases, e.g. Egypt, Tyre[2], etc., both modifying influences have been at work; the Hebrew has been replaced by the Greek, and this again has been Anglicised in form. In the instructions given to our translators it was so ordered: 'The names of the prophets and the holy writers with the other names of the text to be retained as nigh as may be, according as they were vulgarly used.'

With these principles no fault can be found; but the result of their application is not always satisfactory. Our translators are not uniformly consistent with themselves; and moreover time has very considerably altered the conditions of the problem as it presents itself now.

[1] In this however there is great inconsistency. Thus we have Cush in Is. xi. 11, but Ethiopia in xviii. 1, etc.; Edom in Is. xi. 14, lxiii. 1, but Idumea in xxxiv. 5, 6; Asshur in Hos. xiv. 4, but Assyria elsewhere in this same prophet; Javan in Is. lxvi. 19, but Greece or Grecia in the other prophets; and so with other words.

[2] Yet 'Tyre' and 'Tyrus' are employed indifferently, and without any rule, in the Old Testament.

Digitized by Google

(1) The *first* of these principles, though it commends itself to our own age, was not allowed to pass unquestioned, when first asserted. At the era of the reformation, the persons mentioned in the Old Testament were commonly known (so far as they were known at all) through the Septuagint and Vulgate forms. Thus Ochosias stood for Ahaziah, Achab for Ahab, Sobna for Shebnah, Elias for Elijah, Eliseus for Elisha, Roboam for Rehoboam, Josaphat for Jehoshaphat, Abdias for Obadiah, and the like. In Coverdale's Bible these forms are generally retained; but in the later English Versions there is a tendency to substitute the Hebrew forms, or forms more nearly approaching to them.

In the two Versions, which held the ground when our Authorised Version was set on foot—the Bishops' Bible and the Geneva Bible—this tendency had reached the utmost limit which the English language seemed to allow. In Münster's Latin Bible indeed an attempt had been made to reproduce the Hebrew forms with exactness; and accordingly the names of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel there appear as Jesahiahu, Irmeiahu, and Iechezchel. This extreme point however was never reached by any of our English translators; but still in the Geneva Bible the names of the patriarchs are written Izhak and Iaakob, and in the Bishops' Bible we meet with such forms as Amariahu, Zachariahu.

This tendency was not left unassailed. Gregory Martin in his attack on the 'English Bibles used

Digitized by Google

and authorised since the time of the schism,' published at Rheims in 1582, writes as follows:

Of one thing we can by no means excuse you, but it must savour vanity or novelty or both. As when you affect new strange words which the people are not acquainted withal, but it is rather Hebrew to them than English: *μάλα σεμνῶς ὀνομάζοντες*, as Demosthenes speaketh, uttering with great countenance and majesty. 'Against him came up Nabuchadnezzar, King of Babel,' 2 Par. xxxvi. 6, for 'Nabuchodonosor king of Babylon'; 'Saneherib' for 'Sennacherib'; 'Michaiah's prophecy' for 'Michæa's'; 'Jehoshaphat's prayer' for 'Josaphat's': 'Uzza slain' for 'Oza'; 'when Zerubbabel went about to build the temple' for 'Zorobabel'; 'remember what the Lord did to Miriam' for 'Marie,' Deut. xxxiv; and in your first[1] translation 'Elisa' for 'Elisæus'; 'Pekahia' and 'Pekah' for 'Phaceja' and 'Phacee'; 'Uziahu' for 'Ozias'; 'Thiglath-peleser' for 'Teglath-phalasar'; 'Ahaziahu' for 'Ochozias'; 'Peka son of Remaliahu' for 'Phacee son of Romelia.' And why say you not as well 'Shelomoh' for 'Salomoh,' and 'Coresh' for 'Cyrus,' and so alter every word from the known sound and pronunciation thereof? Is this to teach the people, when you speak Hebrew, rather than English? Were it goodly hearing (think you) to say for 'Jesus' 'Jeshuah'; and for 'Marie' his mother 'Miriam'; and for 'Messias' 'Messiach'; and 'John' 'Jachannan'; and such-like monstrous novelties? which you might as well do, and the people would understand you as well, as when your preachers say, 'Nabucadnezer King of Babel.'

To these charges Fulke gives this brief and sensible reply:

[1] *i.e.* The Great Bible, which was the first Bible in use after 'the schism'; the edition to which Martin refers is that of 1562. The two Bibles, to which Martin's strictures mostly apply, are the Genevan and the Bishops', as being most commonly used when he wrote. See Fulke's *Defence*, etc. p. 67 sq.

Digitized by Google

Seeing the most of the proper names of the Old Testament were unknown to the people before the Scriptures were read in English, it was best to utter them according to the truth of their pronunciation in Hebrew, rather than after the common corruption which they had received in the Greek and Latin tongues. But as for those names which were known to the people out of the New Testament, as Jesus, John, Mary, etc., it had been folly to have taught men to sound them otherwise than after the Greek declination, in which we find them[1].

The attack however was so far successful, that the revisers who produced our Authorised Translation seem to have adopted in each case from the current Versions those forms which least offended the English eye or ear, even though farther removed from the Hebrew. Thus in the examples already given, they write Isaac, Jacob, in preference to Izhak, Iaakob of the Geneva Bible, and Amariah, Zachariah in preference to Amariahu, Zachariahu of the Bishops'.

With the general treatment of the Old Testament names I have no desire to find fault: perhaps the forms in our English Bible approach as nearly to the Hebrew as is desirable. But, when we compare the New Testament with the Old, some important questions arise.

In favour of retaining the old Septuagint and Vulgate forms in preference to introducing the Hebrew, there was this strong argument; that the same person thus appeared under the same name in the New Testament as in the Old. The English reader

[1] Fulke's *Defence of the English Translations of the Bible*, p. 588 sq. (Parker Society's edition).

Digitized by Google

did not need to be informed that Eliseus was the same as Elisha, Ozias as Uzziah, Salathiel as Shealtiel, etc. Now he has not this advantage. Even supposing that the identity of persons is recognised, much unconscious misconception still remains in particular cases. It is very difficult for instance for an English reader, who has not read or thought on the subject, to realise the fact that the Elias, whom the Jews expected to appear in Messiah's days, was not some weird mythical being, or some merely symbolical person, but the veritable Elijah who lived on earth, in flesh and blood, in the days of Ahab. 'Let us just seek to realize to ourselves,' says Archbishop Trench, 'the difference in the amount of awakened attention among a country congregation, which Matt. xvii. 10 would create, if it were read thus: "And his disciples asked him, saying, Why then say the Scribes that *Elijah* must first come?" as compared with what it now is likely to create.' And this argument applies, though in a less degree, to the scene of the transfiguration. It is most important, as the same writer has observed, to 'keep vivid and strong the relations between the Old and New Testament in the minds of the great body of English hearers and readers of Scripture[1].'

I imagine that few would deny the advantage of substituting the more familiar Old Testament names in such cases for the less familiar Septuagint forms

[1] *Authorized Version*, p. 41.

Digitized by Google

preserved in the New; but many more may question whether such a substitution is legitimate, and I venture therefore to add a few words in defence of this reform which I should wish to see introduced.

If at this point we were to invoke the second principle (which has been mentioned above and will be considered presently), that whenever a familiar English form of a name occurs, this shall be substituted for the original, e.g. John for Ioannes, James for Iacobos, Mary for Mariam, this principle alone would justify the change which I am advocating. For, to our generation at least, the familiar English names of the Old Testament personages are Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, etc.; and therefore on this ground alone the Greek forms Elias, Eliseus, Esaias, should give place to them. In the 16th and 17th centuries it might be a question between Esay, Esaie, Esaias, Isaiah; between Abdy, Abdias, Obadiah; between Jeremy, Jeremias, Jeremiah; between Osee, Oseas, Osea, Hosea (or Hoshea); between Sophony, Sophonia, Sophonias, Zephaniah; between Aggeus, Haggeus, Haggai; and the like: but now long familiarity has decided irrevocably in favour of the last forms in each case, and there is every reason why the less familiar modes of representing the names should give place to the more familiar. But, quite independently of this consideration of familiarity, we should merely be exercising the legitimate functions of translators, if in most cases we were to return to the Old Testament forms. For (with very few exceptions) the Greek forms repre-

Digitized by Google

sent the original names as nearly as the vocables and the genius of the Greek language permit; and in translating it is surely allowable to neglect the purely Greek features in the words. This applies especially to terminations, such as Jeremias, Jonas, Manasses, for Jeremiah, Jonah, Manasseh; and in fact the name Elias itself is nothing more than 'Elijah' similarly formed, for the Hebrew word could not have been written otherwise in Greek. It applies also to the change of certain consonants. Thus a Greek had no choice but to represent the *sh* sound by a simple *s*. Like the men of Ephraim, the Greeks could not frame to pronounce the word Shibboleth right; and it is curious to observe to what straits the Alexandrian translator of the narrative in the book of Judges (xii. 5, 6) is driven in his attempt to render the incident into this language[1]. Remembering this, we shall at once replace Cis (Acts xiii. 21) by Kish[2], and Aser (Luke ii. 36, Rev. vii. 6) by Asher; while the English reader will at length discover that the unfamiliar Saron, connected with the history of Æneas (Acts ix. 35), is the well-known Sharon of Old Testament history. Combining this principle of change with the foregoing, we should restore Elisha in place of Eliseus. For the Hebrew gutturals again the Greeks had no equivalent, and were obliged either to omit

[1] He can only say *εἰκὸν δὴ στάχυς* [A has *εἴπατε δὴ σύνθημα*] *καὶ οὐ κατεύθυνε* [A *καὶ κατηύθυναν*] *τοῦ λαλῆσαι οὕτως.*

[2] It is not easy to see why our translators should have written Cis, Core, rather than Kis, Kore.

Digitized by Google

them or to substitute the nearest sound which their language afforded. On this principle they frequently represented the final ה by an ε[1]; and hence the forms Core, Noe, which therefore we should without scruple replace by the more familiar Korah, Noah. In the middle of a word it was often represented by a χ, while our Old Testament translators in this and other positions give an *h*; and thus there is no reason why Rachab, Achaz, should stand in the New Testament for Rahab, Ahaz in the Old. Again, the fact that the aspirate, though pronounced, was never written in Greek should be taken into account; and any divergence from the Hebrew form which can be traced to this cause might be neglected; thus Agar, Ezekias would be replaced by Hagar, Hezekiah, and Josaphat, Roboam, by Jehoshaphat, Rehoboam[2]. By adopting this principle of neglecting mere peculiarities and imperfections of the Greek in the representation of the Hebrew names, and thus endeavouring to reproduce the original form which has undergone the modification, we should in almost

[1] The genealogies at the beginning of the Books of Chronicles in the LXX offer very many instances of this change. Sometimes this final ε represents an ע or a ה.

[2] For Ῥαάβ (Heb. xi. 31, James ii. 25) our translators have boldly written 'Rahab.' While speaking of aspirates, it may be mentioned that in the edition of 1611 the normal spelling in the New Testament is 'Hierusalem'; the only exceptions which I have noticed being 1 Cor. xvi. 3, Gal. i. 17, 18, ii. 1, iv. 25, 26, Heb. xii. 22, and the headings of some chapters (e.g. Acts xxi, Rev. xxi), where 'Ierusalem' appears. On the other hand in the Old Testament it is 'Ierusalem,' though 'Hierusalem' occurs in the heading of 2 Sam. xiv.

Digitized by Google

every important instance bring the names in the Old and New Testament into conformity with each other. A very few comparatively trifling exceptions would still remain, where the Greek form cannot be so explained. These might be allowed to stand; or if the identity of the person signified was beyond question (e.g. Aram and Ram), the Old Testament form might be replaced in the text, and the Greek form given in the margin.

(2) The *second* of the two principles, which were enunciated above as guiding our English translators, also requires some consideration.

Under this head the *inconsistency* of our Authorised Version will need correction, for it is incapable of defence. If the prophet was to be called Osee[1]

[1] It may be questioned whether this word should be pronounced as a dissyllable, the double *e* being regarded as an English termination as in Zebedee, Pharisee, etc., or as a trisyllable, the word being considered as a reproduction of the Greek Ὡσηέ.

On the other hand there can, I think, be no doubt that the modern fashion of pronouncing the final *e* of Magdalene, as though it represented the η of the original, is erroneous. The word is far older than the translations made from the Greek in the 16th and 17th centuries, and came from the Latin. Though in the A.V. (1611) the spelling is always 'Magdalene,' yet in the earlier Versions it is indifferently Magdalen and Magdalene. Wycliffe writes it 'Mawdeleyn'—a pronunciation which has survived in the names of our Colleges and in the adjective 'maudlin.' There is no more reason for sounding the last letter in Magdalene, than in Urbane (Rom. xvi. 9).

This last word is printed 'Urbane,' in all the early editions of the A.V. which I have consulted (1611, 1612, 1617, 1629, 1630, 1637). On the other hand the earlier Versions without exception, so far as I have noticed, have 'Urban' or 'Urbanus.' In the Authorised Version (1611) these final *e*'s were common; thus we find Hebrewe, Jewe, Marke, Romane, Samaritane, etc.

Digitized by Google

in the New Testament (Rom. ix. 26), there is no reason why he should have remained Hosea in the Old. If the country appears as Greece in Zechariah (ix. 13) and in the Acts (xx. 2), why should it be named Grecia in the book of Daniel (viii. 21, x. 20, xi. 2)? If the inhabitants of this country are Greeks in the New Testament, why should they be Grecians in the Old (Joel iii. 6)[1]? If Mark is substituted for Marcus in some passages (Acts xii. 12, 25, 2 Tim. iv. 11), why should Marcus have been allowed to stand in others (Col. iv. 10, Philem. 24, 1 Pet. v. 13)? Nay, so far does this inconsistency go, that Jeremy and Jeremias occur in the same Gospel (Matt. ii. 17, xvi. 14): Luke and Lucas in two companion Epistles sent at the same time, from the same place, and to the same destination (Col. iv. 14, Philem. 24); and Timothy and Timotheus in the same chapter of the same Epistle (2 Cor. i. 1, 19). In all these cases the form which is *now* the most familiar should be consistently adopted. This rule would substitute Jeremiah for Jeremy, but on the other hand it would prefer Mark to Marcus. At the same time both Cretes (Acts ii. 11) and Cretians (Tit. i. 12) would disappear, and Cretans take their place.

[1] In the New Testament 'Grecian' is reserved for Ἑλληνιστής, while 'Greek' represents Ἕλλην. This distinction is good, as far as it goes; but in order to convey any idea to an English reader Ἑλληνιστής should be translated by 'Grecian Jew' or by some similar phrase.

As Ἕλλην is translated 'Gentile' without hesitation elsewhere (e.g. 1 Cor. x. 32, xii. 13), it is strange that this rendering is not adopted for Ἑλληνίς, where it would have avoided an apparent contradiction. Mark vii. 26 'A Greek, a Syrophenician by nation.'

Digitized by Google

This principle, if consistently carried out, would rule one very important example. Familiar usage, which requires that the name JESUS should be retained when it designates the most sacred Person of all, no less imperatively demands that *Joshua* shall be substituted when the great captain of Israel and conqueror of Palestine is intended. For the same reason we speak of the Patriarch as *Jacob* and the Apostle as *James*; of the sister of Moses as *Miriam*, and the mother of the Lord as *Mary*. It so happens that both the passages in which the name Jesus designates the Israelite captain (Acts vii. 45, Heb. iv. 8) are more or less obscure either from difficulties in the context or from defects of translation; and the endless confusion, which is created in the minds of the uneducated by the retention of this form, is a matter of everyday experience.

This last example leads me to speak of another point. There can be little doubt that, when the same person is intended, the same form should be adopted throughout. But what should be done, when the name which has a familiar English form applies to unfamiliar persons? Thus the English *John* corresponds to the Greek Ἰωάνης or Ἰωάννης, and to the Hebrew *Jehohanan* or *Johanan* (יְהוֹחָנָן or יוֹחָנָן). Are we then in every case to substitute John, where either the Greek or the Hebrew form occurs? No one would think of displacing John the Baptist, or John the son of Zebedee, or John surnamed Mark. But what are we to do with the Old Testament per-

Digitized by Google

sonages bearing this name? What with those who are mentioned in S. Luke's genealogy, where apparently the name occurs more than once in forms more or less disguised (iii. 24 (?), 27, 30)? What with John i. 43, xxi. 15, 16, 17, where our English Version gives 'Simon son of Jona,' but where the true reading in the original is doubtless Ἰωάνου? I do not know that any universal rule can be laid down; but probably the practice, adopted by our translators, of reproducing the name when it occurs in the Hebrew form, and translating it when in the Greek, would be generally approved. Yet perhaps an exception might be made of John i. 43, xxi. 15, 16, 17, where it is advisable either in the text or in the margin to show the connexion of form with the Βαριωνᾶ of Matt. xvi. 17[1]. Again, in the English Version there is the

[1] This form Ἰωνᾶ may represent two distinct Hebrew names: (1) יונה 'A dove,' the prophet's name, Jonah: (2) יוחנן 'The grace of Jehovah,' Johanan or John. This last is generally written Ἰωανάν or Ἰωάνης (the form Ἰωάννης with the double ν has inferior support). Contracted it becomes Ἰωάν or Ἰωνά, the first α being liable to be slurred over in pronunciation, because the Hebrew accent falls on the last syllable. For Ἰωνάν see 1 Chron. xii. 12 (A, Ιωαν א), xxvi. 3 (A), Neh. vi. 18 (B), Ezra x. 6 (א corr. from Ιωαναν), 1 Esdr. ix. 1 (B), Luke iii. 27 (v. l.), iii. 30 (v. l.); for Ἰωνά, 2 Kings xxv. 23 (B), Luke iii. 30 (v. l.). Thus the υἱὸς Ἰωάνου of S. John is equivalent to the Βαριωνᾶ of S. Matthew. The longer form of the name of S. Peter's father was preserved also in the Gospel of the Hebrews, as we learn from a marginal note in an early cursive MS (see Tischendorf, *Notit. Cod. Sin.* p. 58) on Matt. xvi. 17, Βαριωνᾶ τὸ Ἰουδαϊκὸν υἱὲ Ἰωάννου; and in an extant fragment inserted in the Latin translation of Origen *in Matt.* xix. 19 (III. p. 671 sq., ed. Delarue), but omitted in the Greek, we read 'Simon fili Joanne, facilius est camelum etc.' From not understanding that the two are forms of the same name, some harmonizer devised the

Digitized by Google

greatest confusion in the forms of another name, *Judah, Judas, Juda, Jude.* Thus the patriarch is called both *Juda* and *Judah* in the same context (Heb. vii. 14, viii. 8), and *Judas* and *Juda* in parallel narratives (Matt. i. 2, 3, Luke iii. 33): and again, the brother of Jesus is called *Judas* in one Evangelist (Matt. xiii. 55) and *Juda* in another (Mark vi. 3). The principle of familiarity suggests *Jude* for the writer of the Epistle; *Judah* for the patriarch and the tribe and country named from him; and *Judas* for Iscariot and for the other less known persons bearing the name; while Juda, which occurs for the patriarch or tribe (Luke iii. 33, Heb. vii. 14, Rev. v. 5, vii. 5) and the country (Matt. ii. 6, Luke i. 39), as well as for other unknown persons (Luke iii. 26 (?), 30), ought to disappear wholly. And so far as regards Judah and Judas, it would be well to follow this principle; but, when the name is used of the author of the Epistle, though Jude might (if it were thought fit) be retained in the title, yet Judas should be substituted for Jude in the opening verse, so as not to preclude the identification of this person with the Lord's brother (which is highly probable), or again with his namesake in S. Luke's

statement which we find in a list of Apostles preserved in the Paris MSS Reg. 1789, 1026 (quoted by Cotelier, *Patr. Apost.* I. p. 275), Πέτρος καὶ Ἀνδρέας ἀδελφοί, ἐκ πατρὸς Ἰωνᾶ, μητρὸς Ἰωαννᾶ, or as it is otherwise read ἐκ πατρὸς Ἰωάννου, μητρὸς Ἰωνᾶς. Our Lord seems to allude to the meaning of the word in Matt. xvi. 17 'Blessed art thou Simon Bar Jona (Son of the Grace of God), for flesh and blood did not reveal it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.' There is probably a similar allusion in all the passages in S. John.

Digitized by Google

lists of the Apostles (which has commended itself to many).

An error greater than any hitherto mentioned is the rendering of the female name Euodia (*Εὐοδίαν* Phil. iv. 2) by the masculine Euodias[1]; while conversely it seems probable that we should render the name *Ἰουνίαν*, one of S. Paul's kinsfolk, who was 'noted among the Apostles' (Rom. xvi. 7), by Junias (*i.e.* Junianus), not Junia[2].

Whether in certain cases a name should be retained or translated, will be a matter of question; but no defence can be offered for the inconsistency of retaining 'Areopagus' in Acts xvii. 19 and rendering it 'Mars-hill' three verses below. Nor again is there any reason why *κρανίου τόπος* should be translated 'A (or the) place of a skull' in three Gospels (Matt. xxvii. 33, Mark xv. 22, John xix. 17), and *ὁ τόπος ὁ καλούμενος κρανίον* 'The place which is called *Calvary*' in the fourth (Luke xxiii. 33)[2]. In all places where it is possible, the practice of rendering seems to be preferable; and by the 'Three Taverns' a fresh touch is added to the picture of S. Paul's journey (Acts xxviii. 15), which would have been yet more vivid if consistently therewith our translators had

[1] See above, p. 128.

[2] The word 'Jewry' which was common in the older Versions for Judah or Judæa, has almost disappeared in the Authorised Version of the New Testament, but still remains in two passages (Luke xxiii. 5, John vii. 1). In Dan. v. 13 'The children of the captivity of Judah, whom the king my father brought out of Jewry', the same word in the original is rendered both 'Judah' and 'Jewry'.

Digitized by Google

rendered Ἀππίου Φόρου 'The Market of Appius,' as it stands in the Geneva Version[1].

The question between reproduction and translation becomes more important when we turn from proper names to official titles and technical terms, such as weights, measures, and the like. In the Old Testament our translators have frequently adopted the former principle, e.g. bath, cor, ephah, etc.: in the New, they almost universally adhere to the latter.

In a Version which aims at being popular rather than literary, the latter course seems to be amply justified[2]. Yet, when the principle is conceded, the application is full of difficulty. The choice very often lies between giving a general expression which con-

[1] Another fault is the rendering both Φοῖνιξ, the haven of Crete (Acts xxvii. 12), and Φοινίκη, the country of Phœnicia (Acts xi. 19, xv. 3), by the same word 'Phenice' (after the Bishops' and Geneva Bibles); while conversely Φοινίκη has two different renderings, 'Phenice' (xi. 19, xv. 3), and 'Phenicia' (xxi. 2). The older Versions generally, as late as the Great Bible, have 'Phenices' or 'Phenyces' for both words. Did our translators intend the final *e* of 'Phenice', when it represents Phœnix, to be mute, on the analogy of Beatrix, Beatrice?

[2] At all events, whichever course is adopted, it should be carried out consistently. Thus there is no reason why Ῥαββί should be sometimes reproduced in the English Version (Matt. xxiii. 7, 8, John i. 39, 50, iii. 2, 26, vi. 25) and sometimes rendered 'Master' (Matt. xxvi. 25, 49, Mark ix. 5, xi. 21, xiv. 45, John iv. 31, ix. 2, xi. 8), or in like manner why Ῥαββουνί, which only occurs twice, should be once translated 'Lord' (Mark x. 51) and once retained (Joh. xx. 16).

In the same way the word πάσχα, which is generally rendered 'Passover', is represented once and only once by 'Easter' (Acts xii. 4). This is a remnant of the earlier Versions in which πάσχα is commonly translated so, even in such passages as Luke xxii. 1 ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων ἡ λεγομένη πάσχα 'which is called Easter', where however the Geneva and Bishops' Bibles substitute 'Passover'.

Digitized by Google

veys no very definite idea, and adopting some technical term which is precise enough to the English ear but suggests a conception more or less at variance with the original.

How, for instance, are we to treat *ἀνθύπατος*? Wycliffe reproduced the Latin 'proconsul'. The earlier Versions of the Reformed Church generally give 'ruler of the county,' 'ruler'. The Authorised Version adopts the rendering of the Geneva and Bishops' Bibles, 'deputy of the country', 'deputy'. This last has now nothing to recommend it. In the 16th century, when the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland was styled Deputy, the word would convey a sufficiently precise idea; but now it suggests a wrong conception, if it suggests any at all. What sense, for instance, can an English reader attach to the words 'The law is open, and there are *deputies*' (Acts xix. 38), which in the Authorised Version are given as the rendering of *ἀγόραιοι ἄγονται*[1] *καὶ ἀνθύπατοί εἰσιν*? The term which in the 19th century corresponds most nearly to the *deputy* of 16th is *lieutenant-governor*, and indeed the Geneva Testament did in one passage (Acts xviii. 12) translate *ἀνθύπατος* by 'lieutenant of the country', but this rendering was dropped in the Geneva Bible, and not taken up again. To this pre-

[1] Why the slovenly translation 'the law is open' should have been allowed to remain it is difficult to see. In the margin our translators suggest 'the court days are kept'. They would have earned our gratitude if in this and other cases they had acted with more boldness and placed in the text the more correct renderings which they have been content to suggest in the margin.

Digitized by Google

cise language however exception might be taken; and if so, we should be obliged to fall back on some general term, such as 'governor,' 'chief-magistrate,' or the like. With the rendering of γραμματεύς, 'town-clerk,' in Acts xix. 35, I should not be disposed to find fault, for it is difficult to suggest a more exact equivalent. In the context of the same passage however (ver. 31) an English reader would not understand that the '*rulers* of Asia' were officers appointed to preside at the festivals, and perhaps '*presidents* of Asia' might be substituted with advantage (for the word occurs in the English Bible), though it is impossible entirely to remove an obscurity which exists also in the Greek Ἀσιάρχης. In Rom. xvi. 23 the substitution of 'treasurer' for 'chamberlain' in the rendering of ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως would be an improvement[1]; for 'treasurer' again is a good Biblical word, and we do not use 'chamberlain' to describe such an officer as is here intended[2].

On the whole however the rendering of official titles in our Version is fairly adequate and cannot be much improved. If there is occasionally some inconsistency and want of method, as for instance when χιλίαρχος is translated 'chief-captain' and ἑκατόνταρχος reproduced as 'centurion' in the same context[3] (Acts xxi. 31, 32, xxii. 24—26, xxiii. 17—23), still

[1] Wycliffe has 'treasurer', the Rheims Version 'cofferer': while the Versions of the Reformed Church render it 'chamberlain'.

[2] Perhaps I ought to except the Chamberlain of the City of London.

[3] Some of the older Versions translate the words 'upper' or 'high captain', and 'under captain', respectively.

Digitized by Google

these renderings have established a prescriptive right, and an adequate reason must be shown for disturbing them. In Acts xvi. 35, 38 *ῥαβδοῦχοι* 'lictors' is well rendered 'sergeants'; and in xxviii. 16 the translation of *στρατοπεδάρχης*, the *præfectus prætorio*, as 'captain of the guard' is a great improvement on the less precise renderings of the earlier Versions; 'chief-captain of the host' (Tyndale, Great Bible, Bishops'), 'chief-captain' (Coverdale), 'general captain' (Geneva); and with the addition of one word might very well stand, 'chief-captain (or captain-general) of the guard.' On the other hand in Mark vi. 27 *σπεκουλάτωρ*, which signifies 'a soldier of the guard,' should not have been rendered 'executioner' (in the earlier Versions it is 'hangman'), for this term describes a mere accident of his office.

But if official titles are on the whole fairly rendered, this is not the case with another class of technical terms, denoting coins, weights, and measures.

As regards coins, the smaller pieces are more adequately translated than the larger. No better rendering than 'mite' is possible for *λεπτόν*, or than 'farthing' for *κοδράντης* 'quadrans'; and the relation of the two coins is thus preserved (Mark xii. 42 *λεπτὰ δύο, ὅ ἐστιν κοδράντης*). But from this point the inadequacy and inconsistency begin. Why *ἀσσάριον*, the late Greek diminutive used for the *as*, of which therefore the *κοδράντης* is a fourth part, should still be translated a *farthing*[1] (which elsewhere represents

[1] In Matth. x. 29 the Geneva Testament (1557) had rendered

Digitized by Google

κοδράντης) rather than a *penny*, it is difficult to see (Matt. x. 29, Luke xii. 6). And, as we advance in the scale, the disproportion between the value of the original coin and the English substitute increases. Thus the *denarius*, a silver piece of the value originally of ten and afterwards of sixteen ases, is always rendered a *penny*. Its absolute value, as so much weight in metal, is as nearly as possible the same as the French franc. Its relative value, as a purchasing power, in an age and a country where provisions were much cheaper was considerably more. Now, it so happens that in almost every case where the word δηνάριον occurs in the New Testament it is connected with the idea of a *liberal* or *large* amount; and yet in these passages the English rendering names a sum which is absurdly small. Thus the Good Samaritan, whose generosity is intended to appear throughout, on leaving takes out 'two pence' and gives them to the innkeeper to supply the further wants of the wounded man. Thus again the owner of the vineyard, whose liberality is contrasted with the niggardly envious spirit, the 'evil eye' of others, gives, as a day's wages, a penny to each man. It is unnecessary to ask what impression the mention of this sum will leave on the minds of an uneducated peasant or shopkeeper of the present day. Even at the time when our Version was made and when wages were lower, it must have seemed wholly inadequate[1]. The in-

ἀσσάριον by a *half-penny* (as Wycliffe), and similarly δύο ἀσσάρια in Luke xii. 6 by a *penny*. The rest give it a farthing, as in the A. V.

[1] The rendering 'a penny' was probably handed down in this familiar

Digitized by Google

adequacy again appears, though not so prominently, in the two hundred pence, the sum named as insufficient to supply bread to the five thousand (Mark vi. 37, John vi. 7), and similarly in other cases (e.g. Mark xiv. 5, John xii. 5, Luke vii. 41). Lastly, in the Book of the Revelation (vi. 6) the announcement, which in the original implies famine prices, is rendered in our English Version, 'A measure of wheat for a penny, and three measures of barley for a penny.' The fact is that the word χοῖνιξ, here translated 'measure', falls below the amount of a quart, while the word δηνάριον, here translated 'a penny', approaches towards the value of a shilling. To the English reader the words must convey the idea of enormous plenty[1]. Another word *drachma* occurs in the parable of the lost money in S. Luke xv. 8, 9, where it is translated *piece of silver.* Yet the Greek drachma is so nearly equal in value to the Roman denarius, that it may be questioned whether the same coin is not meant by both terms[2];

parable from the time when this sum would be no inadequate remuneration for a day's labour; but long before the Versions of the Reformed Church were made, this had ceased to be the case. Even in Henry the VIIIth's reign a labourer earned from sixpence to eightpence a day (Froude I. p. 29 sq.); though after the Restoration the rate of wages does not seem to have advanced much upon this amount (see Macaulay I. p. 413).

[1] A 'measure' in some parts of England is or was equivalent to a Winchester bushel. At all events it would suggest a large rather than a small quantity.

[2] See Plin. *N. H.* xxi. 109 'Drachma Attica denarii argentei habet pondus.' This parable does not occur in S. Matthew and S. Mark, and must have been derived by S. Luke from some independent

Digitized by Google

and, if *piece of silver* or *silver-piece* is a reasonable translation of drachma, it might very well be employed to render denarius. Again, in the incident relating to the tribute-money (Matt. xvii. 24 sq.) mention is made of two different coins or sums of money, the *didrachma* and the *stater*, the latter being double of the former; and this relation of value is important, and should have been preserved if possible, because it explains our Lord's words, 'Take it (the stater) and give unto them *for me and for thee*.' In our Version however didrachma is rendered 'tribute-money, tribute,' and stater 'a piece of money.' Of larger amounts *mina* (μνᾶ) is translated a 'pound' in one parable (Luke xix. 13)[1]; while in two others (Matt. xviii. 24 sq., xxv. 14 sq.) *talent* is allowed to stand. From the latter of these comes the secondary metaphorical sense of the word 'talent,' which has entirely superseded the literal meaning in common language.

The treatment of measures again is extremely loose. The μετρητής indeed is fairly rendered 'firkin' in John ii. 6; and the *modius* appears as 'bushel' (Matt. v. 15, Mark iv. 21, Luke xi. 33), where the English measure, though greatly in excess of the Latin, which

source. Hence, as addressing Greek readers chiefly, he would not unnaturally name a Greek coin in preference. Similarly it was seen above (p. 112) that ὁρεινή is confined to S. Luke in that portion of his narrative which does not run parallel with the other two Evangelists.

[1] The Wycliffite Versions have 'besaunt' for μνᾶ here; but the carelessness with which the word is used appears from the fact that they employ it also to render *drachma* on the one hand (Luke xv. 8) and *talentum* on the other (Matt. xviii. 24 (v. l.), xxv. 16).

Digitized by Google

is about a peck, may nevertheless remain undisturbed, since nothing depends on exactness. With these exceptions, the one word 'measure' is made to do duty for all the terms which occur in the original. Thus in Rev. vi. 6, already quoted, it stands for a χοῖνιξ, something under a quart; and in other passages it represents not less than three Hebrew measures, the σάτον or seah (Matt. xiii. 33, Luke xiii. 21), the βάτος, the bath or ephah, and the κόρος, the cor or homer (both in Luke xvi. 6, 7), though the seah is one-third of the bath, and the bath one-tenth of the cor. In the former of these two passages from the Gospels accuracy is unimportant, for the 'three measures of meal' in the parable will tell their tale equally, whatever may be the contents of the measure: though even here we may regret that our translators deserted the more precise 'peck,' which they found in some of the older Versions. But in Luke xvi. 6, 7, where the *bath* and the *cor* are mentioned in the same context, they should certainly be distinguished. The κόροι σίτου might very well be rendered '*quarters* of wheat' with Tyndale and several of the older Versions. For the βάτοι ἐλαίου it is more difficult to find an equivalent: Wycliffe renders βάτους by 'barrels'; the Rheims Version by 'pipes.' In Rev. vi. 6 it is still more important to aim at precision, because the extremity of the famine only appears when the proper relation between the measure and the price is preserved. Here χοῖνιξ might very well be translated 'a quart.'

Digitized by Google

§ 7.

This discussion has been occupied hitherto with questions affecting the correctness of our Version, as representing the Greek. It remains to consider the English in itself, as a literary production rather than as a translation, and to ask how far it is capable of amendment from this point of view.

And here I certainly am not disposed to dissent from the universal verdict, in which those least disposed to stubborn conservatism have most heartily concurred, and which has been reasserted only the more emphatically since the question of revision was started. But those who having studied our English Version most carefully, and therefore have entered most fully into its singular merits, will be the least disposed to deny that here and there the reviser's hand may be employed with advantage.

Under this head the *archaisms* demand to be considered first. Whatever may have been the feeling in generations past, there is no disposition in the present age to alter the character of our Version. The stately rhythm and the archaic colouring are alike sacred in the eyes of all English-speaking peoples. On the other hand it must be borne in mind that our Version addresses itself not to archæologists and critics, but to plain folk. And these two considerations combined should guide the pen of the

Digitized by Google

reviser. So long as an archaism is intelligible, let it by all means be retained. If it is misleading or ambiguous or inarticulate, the time for removing it has come.

As examples of innocent archaisms we might quote 'bewray,' 'despite,' 'list,' 'strait,' 'travail,' 'twain,' and hundreds of others. Whether it would be necessary to wring the heart of the archæologist by removing 'all to brake' and 'earing,' we need not stop to consider, as they do not occur in the New Testament.

If on the other hand I were asked to point out a *guilty* archaism, I should lay my finger at once on the translation of μεριμνᾷν in Matt. vi. 25, 31, 34, μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε '*Take no thought* for your life, what ye shall eat,' μὴ μεριμνήσητε λέγοντες τί φάγωμεν '*Take no thought* saying What shall we eat?', μὴ μεριμνήσητε εἰς τὴν αὔριον '*Take no thought* for the morrow.' I have heard of a political economist alleging this passage as an objection to the moral teaching of the Sermon on the Mount on the ground that it encouraged, nay commanded, a reckless neglect of the future. I have known of cases in which scrupulous consciences have been troubled by language seeming to condemn their most reasonable acts of care and forethought; of others in which religious persons have been misled by this paramount authority (as it seemed to be) into a systematic improvidence. A knowledge of the Greek would have shown that it is not reasonable fore-

Digitized by Google

thought but distress and anxiety about the future which our Lord forbids; for this, and not less than this, is the force of *μέριμνα*, as may be seen from such passages as 1 Pet. v. 7 *πᾶσαν τὴν μέριμναν ὑμῶν ἐπιρίψαντες ἐπ' αὐτόν, ὅτι αὐτῷ μέλει περὶ ὑμῶν*, where the distinction of *μέριμνα* and *μέλειν* is significant, though effaced in our English Version, 'Casting all your *care* upon Him, for He *careth* for you.' A study of English archaisms again would have taught that our translators did not intend what they seem to say, for to 'take thought' in the old language meant to distress or trouble oneself[1]. But the great mass of people have neither the time nor the opportunity, even if they had the capacity, for such investigations. This archaism therefore is one which at all hazards should disappear in any revision of the English Bible. For 'take no thought' some have suggested 'be not careful.' But this, though an improvement, is very far from adequate. For *carefulness*, though in the 16th and 17th centuries it might be a term of reproof[2], in the modern lan-

[1] e. g. 1 Sam. ix. 5, 'Come, and let us return, lest my father...*take thought* for us', where the Hebrew verb is דאג, which Gesenius renders *sollicitus fuit, anxie timuit.* 'To die of thought' in the old language was to die heart-broken. On this archaism see Trench *Authorized Version* p. 14, Wright *Bible Word-Book* s. v.

[2] In fact it is used more than once to translate this very word *μέριμνα*, e. g. 1 Cor. vii. 32 'I would have you without *carefulness*', *i.e.* anxiety (*θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀμερίμνους εἶναι*), Phil. iv. 6 'Be *careful* for nothing' (*μηδὲν μεριμνᾶτε*).

Latimer *Serm.* p. 400 (quoted in Wright's *Bible Word-Book* s. v.) speaks of 'this wicked carefulness', an expression which in the modern language would be a contradiction in terms.

Digitized by Google

guage almost always implies commendation. In fact it is an archaism open to the same misapprehension, though not to the same degree, as 'take no thought.' 'Be not anxious' or 'be not troubled' would adequately express the original. The word 'anxious', it is true, does not occur in our English Bible, but this is one of those rare instances where our new revisers might well assume the liberty, which the authors of the Received Version certainly claimed and exercised before them, of introducing a new word, where the language has shifted and no old word conveys the exact meaning.

But though 'take no thought' is the worst offender of all, yet other archaisms might with advantage be removed. We may suspect that many an Englishman, when he hears of Zacharias 'asking for a *writing table* (Luke i. 63),' conceives a notion very different from the Evangelist's own meaning. We have heard how the enquiring school-boy has been perplexed at reading that S. Paul and his companions '*fetched a compass*,' when they set sail from Syracuse (Acts xxviii. 13), not being able to reconcile this statement with the date given for the invention of this instrument. We can well imagine that not a few members of an average congregation, when the incident in the synagogue at Nazareth is read and they hear that the book, when closed, is handed 'to the *minister*' (Luke iv. 20), do not carry away quite the correct idea of the person intended by this expression. We must have misgivings whether our

Digitized by Google

Lord's injunction to the disciples to 'take no *scrip*' with them, or S. Luke's statement that the Apostle's company 'took up their *carriages* and went up to Jerusalem' (Acts xxi. 15), are universally understood. We may feel quite certain that the great majority of readers do not realise the fact (for how should they?) that by the highest and the lowest *rooms* in the parable are meant merely the *places* or *seats*[1] at the top or bottom of the same table, and that therefore the invitation to 'go up higher' does not imply mounting a staircase to a more dignified reception-room in the upper storey. We find that even a scholarly divine[2] seems to infer from S. Paul's language (1 Tim. v. 4) the duty incumbent not only on children but even on *nephews* of providing for their aged relations; and finding this we can hardly expect illiterate persons to know that in the old language *nephew* signifies *grandchild.*

Among these misleading archaisms the word *coast* for 'border' or 'region' is perhaps the most frequent. It would be unreasonable to expect the English reader to understand that when S. Paul 'passes through the *upper coasts*' (τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη) on his way to Ephesus (Acts xix. 1), he does in fact traverse the high land which lies in the *interior* of Asia

[1] Again in 1 Cor. xiv. 16 'He that *occupieth* the *room* of the unlearned', a double archaism obscures the sense of the original ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον 'He that *filleth* the *place*'.

[2] Blunt *Church of the First Three Centuries* p. 27 'She was to have none of those children able to minister to her nor yet nephews'; see Trench's *Authorized Version* p. 18.

Digitized by Google

Minor. Again in the Gospels, when he reads of our Lord visiting 'the *coasts* of Tyre and Sidon' (Matt. xv. 21, Mark vii. 31), he naturally thinks of the seaboard, knowing these to be maritime cities, whereas the word in one passage stands for *μέρη* 'parts,' and in the other for *ὅρια* 'borders,' and the circumstances suggest rather the eastern than the western frontier of the region. And perhaps also his notions of the geography of Palestine may be utterly confused by reading that Capernaum is situated 'upon the seacoast' (Matt. iv. 13).

Then again, how is such a person to know that when S. Paul condemns 'debate' together with envy, wrath, murder, and the like (Rom. i. 29, 2 Cor. xii. 20), he denounces not discussion, but contention, strife (*ἔρις*); or that when he says, 'If any man have a quarrel against any' (Col. iii. 13), he means a complaint (querela), the original being *ἔχῃ μομφήν*; or that, when S. James writes '*Grudge* not one against another' (v. 9), the word signifies 'murmur' or 'bemoan' (*στενάζετε*)? Even if he is aware that 'wicked *lewdness*' (Acts xviii. 14) does not signify gross sensuality, will he also know conversely that by 'the hidden things of *dishonesty*' (2 Cor. iv. 2) the Apostle means not fraudulence, want of probity, but 'secret deeds of *shame*' (*αἰσχύνης*)? If context and common sense alike teach him that the 'highmindedness' which S. Paul more than once condemns (*ὑψηλοφρονεῖν*, Rom. xi. 20, 1 Tim. vi. 17; *τετυφωμένοι*, 2 Tim. iii. 4) is not what we commonly understand

Digitized by Google

by the term, will he also perceive that the 'maliciousness' which is denounced alike by S. Paul (Rom. i. 29 'full of maliciousness') and S. Peter (1 Pet. ii. 16 'not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness') does not denote one special form of evil, but the vicious character generally (*κακία*)?

Again, the expressions *instantly* and *by and by* may be taken in connexion, as being nearly allied. Yet in Biblical language neither signifies what it would signify to ourselves. *Instantly* has not a temporal sense at all, but means 'urgently,' as in Luke vii. 4, 'They besought him *instantly* (*σπουδαίως*)'; while on the other hand *by and by*, having a temporal sense, denotes not deferred but immediate action, standing most frequently for *εὐθύς* or *εὐθέως* and therefore corresponding to the modern sense of *instantly*. Thus in the Greek of the parable of the sower the *instantaneous* welcome of the word has its counterpart in the *instantaneous* apostasy under persecution (Matt. xiii. 20, 21) *εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνων αὐτόν, εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζεται*; but in the English Version this appears, '*Anon* with joy receiveth it,' '*By and by* he is offended'; where partly through the archaisms and partly through the change of words the expressiveness of the original is seriously blunted.

The passage last quoted contains another archaism, which is a type of a whole class. Words derived from the Latin and other foreign languages being comparatively recent had very frequently not arrived at their ultimate sense when our Version was made,

Digitized by Google

and were more liable to shift their meaning than others. We have witnessed this phenomenon in *instantly*, and the same was also the case with *offend*, *offence*. 'If thy right eye *offend* thee,' 'Woe unto him through whom the *offences* come,' do not convey to any but the educated reader the idea which they were intended to express. By substituting 'cause to offend' (or perhaps 'cause to stumble' or 'to fall') for 'offend,' we may in passages where the verb occurs bring out the idea more clearly; but in the case of the substantive the right of prescription and the difficulty of finding an equivalent may plead for the retention of the word. But where other Latinisms are concerned, no such excuse can be pleaded. Thus, 'Occupy till I come' (πραγματεύσασθε, Luke xix. 13) is quite indefensible. Wycliffe has *marchaundise*; Purvey *chaffer*; Tyndale *buy and sell*; and it is difficult to see why a word should have been substituted in the later Bibles, which must (one would think) have appeared novel and affected at the time, and which has changed its meaning since. I have suggested '*Trade* ye' above (p. 42). Another example is 'O *generation* (γεννήματα) of vipers,' which the English reader inevitably takes to be a parallel expression to 'a wicked and adulterous *generation* (γενεά),' though the Greek words are quite different, and generation in the first passage signifies 'offspring' or 'brood'—two good old English words, either of which might advantageously be substituted for it. Another is the rendering of Acts xvii. 23, 'As I passed

Digitized by Google

by and beheld your devotions' (σεβάσματα), where 'your devotions' is not a misrendering but an archaism, signifying 'the objects of your worship,' 'your gods or idols.' Other instances again are 1 Tim. iii. 13, 'They that have used the office of a deacon well, *purchase* (περιποιοῦνται) to themselves a good degree,' where the idea of traffic suggested by the modern use of the word is alien to the passage; and Matt. xvii. 25, 'When he was gone into the house, Jesus *prevented* (προέφθασεν) him, saying, What thinkest thou, Simon?', in which passage at all events the original meaning of 'prevent' would not suggest itself to the English reader. In both cases we might with advantage recur to the renderings of Tyndale, 'get' for 'purchase,' and 'spake first' for 'prevented.'

From the word last mentioned we pass not unnaturally to the verb which it has supplanted. To *prevent* has taken the place of to *let*, meaning to check, to hinder, while this latter verb has become obsolete in this sense. Unnecessary and unadvisable as it would be to alter this archaism in such phrases as 'Sore let and hindered in running the race that is set before us,' where it cannot mislead, its occurrence in the New Testament is not always free from objection. In 2 Thess. ii. 7, for instance—a passage difficult enough without any artificial obscurities—'He who now *letteth*, will *let*,' should not be allowed to stand.

Not very dissimilar to the last instance is the ambiguity of 'go about,' used in our Version as a common rendering of ζητεῖν. In such passages as

Digitized by Google

John vii. 19, 20, 'Why *go* ye *about to* kill me?' 'Who *goeth about to* kill thee?', Acts xxi. 31 'As they *went about to* kill him,' it can hardly occur to the English reader that nothing more is meant than 'seek to kill,' as the same phrase *ζητεῖν ἀποκτεῖναι* is translated elsewhere, and even in the very context of the first passage (John vii. 25). In Acts xxiv. 5, 6, again the misunderstanding is rendered almost inevitable by the context, 'A mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world...who also *hath gone about to* profane the temple'; where the expression represents another verb similar to *ζητεῖν* in meaning, *τὸ ἱερὸν ἐπείρασεν βεβηλῶσαι.*

After disposing of the archaisms, little remains to be said about the English of our Version. There are however some ambiguities of translation which arise from other causes. Thus Ephes. vi. 12 'Against spiritual *wickedness in high places*' (*πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις*), where the English reader is led to think of vice in persons of rank and station; Phil. iii. 14 'The prize of your *high* calling (*τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως*),' where the English epithet rather suggests quality than locality as the original requires; Col. iii. 8 'But now *you* also *put off* all these' (*νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα*), where the sentence appears to be indicative instead of imperative; 1 Tim. iii. 16 'And *without controversy* (*ὁμολογουμένως*) great is the mystery of godliness,' where the meaning of 'controversy' is ambiguous, and where the older Versions translated *ὁμολογουμένως* 'without nay' or 'without doubt';

Digitized by Google

Heb. v. 2 'On the ignorant and on them that are *out of the way*' (τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι καὶ πλανωμένοις), where the repetition of the preposition leads the English reader still further away from the proper sense of πλανωμένοις; Heb. v, 12, 'For when *for the time* ye ought to be teachers' (καὶ γὰρ ὀφείλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι διὰ τὸν χρόνον), where without the Greek no one would imagine that 'for the time' means 'by reason of the long period of your training'; Apoc. iv. 11 'For thy pleasure they *are, and were created* (εἰσὶ καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν[1])', where *are* reads as an auxiliary. In all such cases (and many other examples might be given) the remedy is easy.

The great merit of our Version is its truly English character—the strength and the homeliness of its language. Its authors were fully alive to the importance of preserving this feature, as impressed upon the English Bible by Tyndale, and set their faces resolutely against the Latinisms to which the Rheims Version had attempted to give currency[2]. In this they were eminently successful, as a rule; and it is only to be regretted that they allowed themselves occasionally to depart from their principle where there was no adequate need. The word *occupy*, which I have already considered from a different point of view, is

[1] So the received text: but the correct reading is ἦσαν for εἰσί.

[2] In this Version I open a chapter accidentally (Ephes. iv) and find 'donation of Christ', 'inferior parts', 'doctors', 'circumvention of errour', 'juncture of subministration', 'vanity of their sense', 'impudicity', 'contristate'. Yet it was published nearly thirty years before the Authorised Version.

Digitized by Google

an illustration. Another is *addict* in 1 Cor. xvi. 15, 'They have addicted themselves (ἔταξαν ἑαυτούς) to the ministry of the Saints,' which rendering seems to have been introduced first in the Bishops' Bible, and cannot be considered an improvement on the Geneva Version, 'They have given themselves to minister unto the Saints.' A more flagrant instance is 2 Cor. ix. 13, where a concurrence of Latinisms obscures the sense and mars the English, 'By the experiment of this ministration they glorify God for your professed subjection unto the Gospel of Christ,' where 'experiment' and 'professed' ought at all events to be altered as they have shifted their meaning, and where for once the Rheims Version gives purer English, 'By the proof of this ministry glorifying God in the obedience of your confession unto the Gospel of Christ' (διὰ τῆς δοκιμῆς τῆς διακονίας ταύτης δοξάζοντες τὸν Θεὸν ἐπὶ τῇ ὑποταγῇ τῆς ὁμολογίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ).

A fault of another kind is translating ὄφελον 'I would to God' (1 Cor. iv. 8), though the earlier Versions all give it so, with the exception of Wycliffe whose simpler rendering 'I would' might be adopted with advantage. In this case the introduction of the Divine name is hardly defensible. In the case of μὴ γένοιτο 'God forbid,' the difficulty of finding another idiomatic rendering may possibly excuse it. Yet even here we cannot but regret a rendering which interferes so seriously with the argument, as it presents itself to the English reader, in such passages as

Digitized by Google

Rom. iii. 4, 6, 'God forbid; yea, let God be true (*μὴ γένοιτο, γινέσθω δὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἀληθής*),' 'God forbid, for then how shall God judge the world (*μὴ γένοιτο, ἐπεὶ πῶς κρινεῖ ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον*)?'

I shall pass over instances of careless grammar in the English, because these are not numerous and have been dealt with elsewhere. But it may be worth while to point out inadvertences of another kind; where the same word is twice rendered in the English Version, or where conversely the same English word is made to do duty for two Greek words. Of the latter, examples occur in John xi. 14 '*Then* (*τότε οὖν*) said Jesus unto them plainly,' where 'then' stands for two words, 'then' local and 'then' argumentative; or Rom. vi. 21 'What fruit had ye *then* (*τίνα οὖν καρπὸν εἴχετε τότε*) in those things whereof ye are now ashamed?', where exactly the same error is committed. Of the converse error—the double rendering of the same word—we have an instance in James v. 16, *πολὺ ἰσχύει δέησις δικαίου ἐνεργουμένη*, 'The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much,' where the word 'effectual' is worse than superfluous. This last rendering I am disposed to ascribe to carelessness in correcting the copy for the press. The word would be written down on the copy of the Bishops' Bible which the revisers used, either as a tentative correction or an accidental gloss; and, not having been erased before the copy was sent to the press, would appear in the text[1].

[1] In the Bishops' Bible, which the translators had before them, the

Digitized by Google

To the same cause also we may perhaps ascribe the rendering of 1 Cor. xiv. 23, ἐὰν οὖν συνέλθῃ ἡ ἐκκλησία ὅλη ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. In the Bishops' Bible this stands, 'If therefore all the Church be come together into *one* place,' but in the Authorised, 'If therefore the whole Church be come together into *some* place.' I presume that the revisers intended to alter 'one' into 'the same,' but that this correction was indistinctly made, and being confused with the other correction in the same clause which required a transposition of 'the,' led to the error which stands in our text. What misconception may arise from a mere error of the press, appears from the often discussed phrase, 'Strain *at* a gnat'; where unquestionably our translators intended to retain the rendering of the earlier Versions, 'Strain *out* a gnat,' and the existing text can only be explained as a misprint. Indeed the printing of the edition of 1611 is very far from correct; and if our present Bibles for the most part deserve praise for great accuracy, we owe this to the fact that the text of this first edition was not regarded as sacred or authoritative, but corrections were freely introduced afterwards wherever a plain error was detected. Thus in Exod. xxxviii. 11 '*Hoopes* of the

passage runs 'the fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much'. The only fact connected with previous Versions which I can discover as throwing any light on the insertion of this word 'effectual' is a marginal note in Tomson's New Testament, printed with the Geneva Bible; 'He commendeth prayers by the effects that come of them, that all men may understand that there is nothing more effectual than they are, so that they proceed from a pure mind'.

Digitized by Google

pillars' has been altered into '*hooks* of the pillars'; in Isaiah xlix. 20 'The place is too *straight*' into 'The place is too *strait*'; in Hos. vi. 5 '*Shewed* them by the prophets' (where the word 'shewed' was evidently introduced by an ingenious compositor who did not understand the correct text) into '*Hewed* them by the prophets'; in Ecclus. xliv. 5 '*Rejected* verses' into '*recited* verses'; and the like. In the headings of the chapters too some curious errors in the edition of 1611 were afterwards corrected; e.g. 2 Sam. xxiv, '*eleven* thousand' into '*thirteen hundred* thousand,' 1 Cor. v, 'shamed' into 'shunned[1].' Nay, in some passages the changes made in later editions are even bolder than this; as for instance in 1 Tim. i. 4, *οἰκοδομίαν* [the correct reading is *οἰκονομίαν*] *Θεοῦ τὴν ἐν πίστει* 'Edifying which is in faith,' the word *Θεοῦ* by some inadvertence was untranslated in the edition of 1611, and so it remained for many years afterwards, until in the Cambridge edition of 1638 'godly' was inserted after the earlier Versions, and this has held its ground ever since[2]. As this wise liberty was so

[1] The corrections in Ecclus. xliv. 5, 2 Sam. xxiv, were made in 1612: those in Exod. xxxviii. 11, Is. xlix. 20, Hos. vi. 5, 1 Cor. v, in 1613. A number of errors however still remained, which were removed from time to time in later editions. The edition of 1613, though it corrected some blunders, was grossly inaccurate, as may be seen from the collation with the edition of 1611, prefixed to the Oxford reprint of the latter (1833).

[2] I owe this fact, which has probably been noticed elsewhere, to some valuable MS notes of the late Prof. Grote on the printing of the English Bible. The error may be explained by supposing that the word 'godly' was struck out in the copy of the Bishops' Bible altered for the

Digitized by Google

freely exercised in other cases, it is strange that the obvious misprint 'strain *at*' should have survived the successive revisions of two centuries and a half.

While speaking of errors and corrections of the press, it may be worth while in passing to observe how this license of change has affected the orthography. It would be a surprise to an English reader now to find in his Bible such words as aliant, causey, charet, cise, crudle, damosell, fauchion, fet, fift, flixe, iland, mids, moe, monethes, neesing, oweth (Lev. xiv. 35 for 'owneth'), price (Phil. iii. 14 for 'prize'), renowme, etc. While these have been altered into alien, causeway, chariot, size, curdle, damsel, falchion, fetched, fifth, flux, island, midst, more, months, sneezing, owneth, prize, renown, respectively, a capricious conservatism has retained the archaic spelling in other cases, such as fat, fetches, graff, hoise, pilled, strawed, throughly, for vat, vetches, graft, hoist, peeled, strewed, thoroughly. In some cases this caprice appears in the same word; thus *neesings* is retained in Job xli. 18, while *sneezed* is substituted for *neesed* in 2 Kings iv. 35. This license has had its disadvantages as well as its advantages; if the substitution of 'its' for 'it' (Lev. xxv. 5, 'it owne accord' 1611[1]) was imperatively demanded by the change in the language, the alteration of 'shamefast, shamefastness' into 'shamefaced, shamefacedness' is unfortunate, as suggesting a wrong deri-

press, while the proposed substitution was omitted to be made or was made in such a way that it escaped the eye of the compositor.

[1] See Wright's *Bible Word-Book*, s. v. *It*.

Digitized by Google

vation and an inadequate meaning. Amidst all these changes it is a happy accident that the genuine form of the name of Philemon's wife has survived, though the precedent of the older Versions and the authority of modern commentators alike would have led to the substitution of the Latin name 'Appia' for the Phrygian 'Apphia[1].'

[1] In Philem. 2 the reading is unquestionably 'Απφίᾳ, though some uncial MSS (of little value on a point of orthography) have ἀφφίᾳ, a legitimate form, or ἀμφίᾳ, a manifest corruption: the authority for 'Αππίᾳ is absolutely worthless. The fact is that this word has no connexion (except in sound) with the Roman Appia, but represents a native Phrygian name, which with various modifications appears again and again in the Phrygian inscriptions: e.g. Boeckh *Corp. Inscr.* 3814 Νείκανδρος καὶ 'Αφφία γυνὴ αὐτοῦ, 3826 Πρωτόμαχος 'Αφ[φ]ίᾳ γυναικί, 3932 m τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ 'Α[π]φίᾳ, 3962 'Απφία ἐγὼ κεῖμαι, 3827 l (Appx.) 'Αφφία Μενάνδρου, 3846 z (Appx.) Βωλᾶς 'Αφφίᾳ συνβίῳ. Frequently also we meet with the diminutive ἄπφιον, ἄφφιον, or ἄφιον, as a female name; e. g. 3849, 3891, 3899, 3902 m, 3846 z (Appx.). The form 'Αππη however sometimes occurs. This word may be compared with other common Phrygian names, Ammia, Nania, Tatia, and the masculine Pappias or Papias.

Not observing the Phrygian origin of the name, the commentators speak as though it were the feminine corresponding to the masculine in Acts xxviii. 15 'Αππίου φόρου, and call attention to the difference in form, πφ for ππ. All the older translations, so far as I have observed, print it *Appia*, so that the Authorised Version stands alone in its correctness.

Digitized by Google

V.

I have attempted to show in what directions our English Version is capable of improvement. It will be necessary to substitute an amended for a faulty text; to remove artificial distinctions which do not exist in the Greek; to restore real distinctions which existing there were overlooked by our translators; to correct errors of grammar and errors of lexicography; to revise the treatment of proper names and technical terms; and to remove a few archaisms, ambiguities, and faults of expression, besides inaccuracies of editorship, in the English. All this may be done without altering the character of the Version.

In this review of the question I have done nothing more than give examples of the different classes of errors. An exhaustive treatment of the subject was impossible; and the case therefore is much stronger than it is here made to appear. If for instance any one will take the trouble to go through some one book of the New Testament, as the Epistle to the Hebrews, referring to any recent critical edition of the Greek text and comparing it carefully with the English, he will see that the faults of our Version are very far from being few and slight or imaginary. But if a fair case for revision has been made out, it still remains to ask whether there is any reasonable prospect of success, if the attempt be made at the present time.

Digitized by Google

Now in one important point—perhaps the most important of all—the answer must, I think, be favourable. Greek scholarship has never stood higher in England than it does at the present moment. There is not only a sufficient body of scholars capable of undertaking the work, but there is also (and this is a most important element in the consideration) a very large number besides fully competent to submit the work of the revisers, when completed, to a minute and searching criticism. And, though we may trust that any one who is called to take his share in the work will do so with a deep sense of the responsibility of the task assigned to him, still it will be a great stimulus to feel that he is surrounded by competent critics on all sides, and a great support to be able to gather opinions freely from without. But I would venture to go a step beyond this. I should be glad to think my apprehensions groundless, but there is at least some reason to forbode that Greek scholarship has reached its height in England, and that henceforth it may be expected to decline[1]. The clamours of other branches of learning—more especially of scientific studies—for a recognised place in general

[1] Mr Marsh (*Lectures on the English Language*, xxviii, p. 639) says 'There is no sufficient reason to doubt that at the end of this century the knowledge of biblical Greek and Hebrew will be as much in advance of the present standard, as that standard is before the sacred philology of the beginning of this century.' I wish I could take this very sanguine view of the probable future of the Greek language in England: as regards Hebrew, I have abstained from expressing an opinion.

Digitized by Google

education are growing louder and louder, and must make themselves heard; and, if so, the almost exclusive dominion of the Classical languages is past. I need not here enter into the question whether these languages have or have not been overrated as an instrument of education. It is sufficient to call attention to the fact that, whether rightly or wrongly, public opinion is changing in this respect, and to prepare for the consequences.

And, if we turn from the Greek language to the English, the present moment seems not unfavourable for the undertaking. Many grave apprehensions have been expressed on this point, and alarming pictures are drawn of the fatal results which will follow from any attempt to meddle with the pure idiom of our English Bible. Of the infusion of Latinisms and Gallicisms, with which we are threatened, I myself have no fear. In the last century, or in the beginning of the present, the danger would have been real. The objections urged against the language of our English Bible by those who then advocated revision are now almost incredible. The specimens which they offered of an improved diction of the modern type would appear simply ludicrous to us, if the subject, on which the experiment was tried, had been less grave[1]. The very words which these critics

[1] See examples in Trench's *Authorized Version*, p. 23 sq., and Prof. Plumptre's article in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, s. v. Version, Authorised. 'I remember the relief', writes Mr Matthew Arnold (*Culture and Anarchy*, p. 44), 'with which after long feeling the sway of Franklin's imperturbable good sense, I came upon a project of his for a new

Digitized by Google

would have ejected from our English Bibles, as barbarous or uncouth or obsolete, have again taken their place in our highest poetry, and even in our popular language. And though it is impossible that the nineteenth century should ever speak the language of the sixteenth or seventeenth, still a genuine appreciation and careful study of the Authorised Version and of the older translations will (we may reasonably hope) enable the present revisers, in the corrections which they may introduce, to avoid any anachronisms of diction which would offend the taste or jar upon the ear. There is all this difference between the present advocates of revision and the former, that now we reverence the language and idiom of our English Bibles, whereas they regarded it as the crowning offence which seemed most to call for amendment. In several instances the end may be attained by returning to the renderings of the earlier Versions, which the revisers of 1611 abandoned. In almost every other case the words and even the expressions which the correction requires will be supplied from some other part of the Authorised Version itself. Very rare indeed are the exceptions where this assistance will fail and where it may be necessary to in-

version of the Book of Job to replace the old version, the style of which, says Franklin, has become obsolete and thence less agreeable. "I give," he continues, "a few verses which may serve as a sample of the kind of version I would recommend"....I well remember how when first I read that, I drew a deep breath of relief and said to myself: After all, there is a stretch of humanity beyond Franklin's victorious good sense.'

Digitized by Google

troduce a word for which there is no authority in the English Bibles. In these cases care must be taken that the word so introduced shall be in harmony with the general character of our Biblical diction. So much license the new revisers may reasonably claim for themselves, as it was certainly claimed by the revisers of 1611. If these cautions are observed the Bible will still remain to future generations what it has been to past—not only the store-house of the highest truth, but also the purest well of their native English. Indeed we may take courage from the fact, that the language of our English Bible is not the language of the age in which the translators lived, but in its grand simplicity stands out in contrast to the ornate and often affected diction of the literature of that time[1]. For if the retention of an older and better model was possible in the seventeenth century, it is quite as possible in the nineteenth.

Nor again can there be any reasonable ground for apprehension as to the extent and character of the changes which may be introduced. The regulations under which the new company of revisers will act are a sufficient guarantee against hasty and capricious change. The language which public speakers and newspaper critics have held on this point would only then have force, if absolute power were given to each individual reviser to introduce all his favourite crotchets. But any one, who has acted in

[1] See Marsh's *Lectures*, p. 621 sq.

Digitized by Google

concert with a large number of independent men, trained apart and under separate influences, will know how very difficult it is to secure the consent of two-thirds of the whole body to any change which is not a manifest improvement, and how wholly impossible it would be to obtain the suffrages of this number for a novel and questionable rendering, however important it might seem to its proposer. It is very possible that several corrections which I have suggested here may appear to others in this unfavourable light. Indeed it is hardly probable that in all cases they should escape being condemned; for any one, interested in such a subject, is naturally led to give prominence to those views on which he lays stress himself, just because they appear to him not to have received proper attention from others. But if so, it is morally certain that they will be treated as they deserve, and not suffered to disfigure the Revised Version as it will appear before the public. Indeed if there be any reasonable grounds for apprehension, the danger is rather that the changes introduced will be too slight to satisfy the legitimate demands of theology and scholarship, than that they will be so sweeping as to affect the character of our English Bible.

Lastly; in one respect at least the present Revision is commenced under very auspicious circumstances. There has been great liberality in inviting the cooperation of those Biblical scholars who are not members of the Anglican communion, and they on

Digitized by Google

their part have accorded a prompt and cheerful welcome to this invitation. This is a matter for great thankfulness. It may be accepted as a guarantee that the work is undertaken not with any narrow sectarian aim, but in the broad interests of truth; while also it is an earnest that, if the revision when completed recommends itself by its intrinsic merits (and if it does not, the sooner it is forgotten the better), then no unworthy jealousy will stand in the way of its general reception[1]. And meanwhile may we not cherish a loftier hope? Now for the first time the bishops of our Church and the representatives of our Convocation will meet at the same table with Nonconformist divines, and will engage in a common work of a most sacred kind—the interpretation of those Writings which all alike reverence as the source of their truest inspiration here and the foundation of their highest hopes hereafter. Is it too much to anticipate that by the experience of this united work the Christian communities in England may be drawn more closely together, and that, whether it succeed or fail in its immediate object, it may at least dissipate many prejudices and jealousies, may promote a

[1] 'At this day,' wrote Mr Marsh in 1859, 'there could be no harmony of action on this subject between different churches...So long as this sectarian feeling—for it can be appropriately designated by no other term—prevails on either side, there can be no union upon conditions compatible with the self-respect of the parties' (p. 641 sq.). This preliminary difficulty at least has been overcome; the 'better counsels', of which this able writer seems to have despaired, have prevailed; no wound has been inflicted on self-respect; and entire harmony of action has been attained.

Digitized by Google

better mutual understanding, and thus by fostering inward sympathy may lead the way to greater outward harmony among themselves, and a more intimate union with the Divine Head[1]?

[1] It will be remembered that this hope was expressed before the Revision Company had met. If I felt at liberty to modify the expression by the light of subsequent experience, I should speak even more strongly.

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX.

On the Words ἐπιούσιος, περιούσιος.

I.

THE former of these two words, found only in a petition of the Lord's Prayer, as given both by S. Matthew (vi. 11 *τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον*) and by S. Luke (xi. 3 *τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν*), is a well-known difficulty in Biblical interpretation; and it is certainly a remarkable fact that so much diversity of opinion should be possible regarding an expression which occurs in this most familiar and oftenest repeated passage of the Gospels.

Origen tells us (*de Orat.* 27, 1. p. 245 Delarue) that the word *ἐπιούσιον* does not once occur in Greek literature and that it is not current in the colloquial language (*παρὰ οὐδενὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων οὔτε τῶν σοφῶν ὠνόμασται οὔτε ἐν τῇ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν συνηθείᾳ τέτριπται*). 'It seems,' he adds, 'to have been coined (*πεπλάσθαι*) by the Evangelists. Matthew and Luke agree in using it without any difference. The same course has been taken in other cases also by

Digitized by Google

persons translating from the Hebrew. For what Greek ever used either of the expressions ἐνωτίζου or ἀκουτίσθητι?.....A similar expression to ἐπιούσιον occurs in Moses, being uttered by God, *But ye shall be to me a people* περιούσιος. And it seems to me that both words are formed from οὐσία.'

This statement is important, because it shows that the Greek Fathers derived no assistance in the interpretation of the word from the spoken or written language; and thus their views are not entitled to the deference which we should elsewhere accord to them, as interpreters of a living language of which we only possess the fragmentary remains. In this particular instance they cease to be authorities. The same data, which were open to them, are open to us also; and from these we are free to draw our conclusions independently.

These data are threefold: (1) The etymological form; (2) The requirements of the sense: (3) The tenor of tradition.

This last element seems to me to be especially important in the present case. The Lord's Prayer was doubtless used from very early times in private devotion. It certainly formed a part of the public services of the Church, in which (to mention no other use) it was repeated at the celebration of the Holy Eucharist[1]. The traditional sense therefore which

[1] Of the use of the Lord's Prayer in the early Church, see Bingham's *Antiquities*, XIII. vii. § 1 sq., and Probst *Liturgie der drei ersten Christlichen Jahrhunderte*, index s. v. *Vater unser.*

Digitized by Google

was commonly attached to a word occurring in it must have a high value.

It was chiefly the conviction that justice had not been done to this consideration, which led me to institute the investigation afresh[1]. Previous writers have laid stress on the scholastic interpretation of Origen and his successors, as though this were the best authenticated tradition; when they ought rather to have sought for the common sense of the Church in the primitive versions, which are both earlier in date than Origen, and cover a much wider area. I hope to make the force of the distinction between the scholastic and traditional interpretations clearer in the sequel.

The different explanations which have been given to the word fall into two classes; (1) Those which connect it with *ἰέναι*, deriving it from *ἐπιέναι* through *ἐπιὼν* or *ἐπιοῦσα*, and (2) Those which connect it with *εἶναι*, as a compound from *ἐπὶ* and *οὐσία*. Each class includes various explanations; but the one is distinguished from the other by a simple criterion. The meanings belonging to the one class are *temporal;* to the other, *qualitative.*

In the *first* class we find the following: (i) *to-morrow's,* derived directly from *ἐπιοῦσα* 'the coming-

[1] The fullest recent investigation of the meaning of *ἐπιούσιος,* with which I am acquainted, is in Tholuck's *Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount,* II. p. 172 sq. (Eng. trans.), where he arrives at conclusions different from my own. He gives a list of previous treatises on the subject. Among the more important are those of Pfeiffer and Stolberg in the *Thesaur. Theol. Philol.* II. pp. 116 sq., 123 sq. (Amstel. 1702).

Digitized by Google

day,' or 'the morrow': (ii) *coming*, either taken from ἐπιοῦσα and meaning the same as the last, but more vaguely expressed; or derived directly from ἐπιέναι, ἐπιών (without the intervention of the feminine ἐπιοῦσα): (iii) *daily*, which seems to be got from the first sense, 'for the coming day': (iv) *continual*, which is probably a paraphrastic mode of expressing (i) or (iii): (v) *future*, 'yet to come,' from ἐπιών; in which case the expression is most often applied in a spiritual sense to Christ the bread of life, who shall come hereafter.

Under the *second* head also various explanations are comprised; (i) *for our sustenance*, and so 'necessary,' οὐσία being referred to physical subsistence; (ii) *for our essential life*, and so 'spiritual, eternal,' οὐσία signifying the absolute or higher being; (iii) *preeminent, excellent, surpassing*, as being 'above all οὐσίαι,' and so nearly equivalent to περιούσιος; (iv) *abundant*, a meaning akin to the last, and apparently reached by giving the same sense 'above' to ἐπί; (v) *consubstantial*, a sense which is attained by forcing the meaning of the preposition in another direction[1].

In this list I have enumerated only those meanings which were given to the word during the first five centuries. More recent writers have added to the number; but their interpretations, when not deduced directly from one or other of the senses already

[1] See the passage from Victorinus quoted on p. 221.

Digitized by Google

given, are so far-fetched and so unnatural, that they do not deserve to be seriously considered.

Again, I have confined myself to direct interpretations of ἐπιούσιος, not regarding such variations of meaning as arise from different senses attached to the substantive ἄρτος. Thus for instance 'our *daily* bread' might be either the daily sustenance for the body or the daily sustenance for the soul. But though these two senses are widely divergent, their divergence is not due to any difference of interpretation affecting ἐπιούσιος, with which word alone I am concerned.

I shall now consider the two classes of meanings which are distinguished above, testing them by the considerations already enumerated, (1) the etymology of the word, (2) the requirements of the sense, (3) the tenor of tradition.

§ 1. *The etymology of the word.*

Ἡ ἐπιοῦσα is commonly used for 'the coming day,' 'the morrow.' In this sense it occurs frequently without the substantive ἡμέρα both in Biblical Greek (Prov. xxvii. 1 οὐ γὰρ γινώσκεις τί τέξεται ἡ ἐπιοῦσα, Acts xvi. 11, xx. 15, xxi. 18) and elsewhere (e.g. Polyb. ii. 25. 11, Pausan. iv. 22. 3, Plut. *Mor.* 205 E, 838 D, etc.). See also the references in Lobeck *Phryn.* p. 464. From this word, which had become practically a substantive, the adjective ἐπιούσιος would be formed in the usual way.

Digitized by Google

It is urged indeed (see Suicer *Thes.* s. v. ἐπιούσιος), that the analogy of δευτεραῖος, τριταῖος, etc., would require ἐπιουσαῖος. In replying to this objection we need not (I venture to think) acquiesce in the negative answer that such adjectives are not valid to disprove the existence of a different form in -ιος. Whether we regard the etymology or the meaning, the analogy seems to be false. The termination -αῖος in all these adjectives is suggested by the long α or η of the feminines from which they are derived, δευτέρα, τρίτη, etc.[1]; and the short ending of ἐπιοῦσα is not a parallel case. Moreover the meaning is not the same; for the adjectives in -αῖος fix a date, e.g. τεταρταῖος ἦλθεν 'he came *on the fourth day*,' whereas the sense which we require here is much more general, implying simply *possession* or *connexion*.

Or again, the word might be derived from the masculine participle ἐπιών, as ἑκούσιος from ἑκών, ἐθελούσιος from ἐθέλων, γερούσιος from γέρων, πυγούσιος from πυγών, Ἀχερούσιος (or Ἀχερόντιος) from Ἀχέρων, etc.: see Lobeck *Phryn.* p. 4. To this derivation there is no grammatical objection. Only it may be pleaded that no motive existed for introducing an adjective by the side of ἐπιών, sufficiently powerful to produce the result in an advanced stage of the

[1] It is not meant to assert that forms in αῖος cannot be derived from other words than feminines in ᾱ or η; but as a rule they are derived in this way, though some exceptions occur: see Buttmann *Ausf. Gramm.* II. p. 446.

Digitized by Google

language, when the fertility of creating new forms had been greatly impaired.

On the other hand the derivation of ἐπιούσιος from ἐπὶ and οὐσία, if not impossible, is at least more difficult. Two objections have been taken to this etymology; the one, as it seems to me, futile—the other really formidable, if not insuperable. (1) It is alleged that an adjective in -ούσιος would not be formed from the substantive οὐσία. To this it is sufficient to reply, that from this very word οὐσία we find the compounds ἀνούσιος (Clem. Alex. *Exc. Theod.* p. 970, ed. Potter: Pseudo-Justin *Conf. dogm. Arist.* § 50, p. 145; ib. *Quæst. Christ. ad Gent.* p. 185 B), ἐνούσιος (Victorin. *c. Arium* ii. 1, Synes. *Hymn.* 2, p. 318, Cyril. Alex. *in Joann.* v. 5, p. 527), ἐξούσιος (Philo *in Flacc.* § 10, II. p. 528 Mang.), ἑτερούσιος (ἑτερουσίως Porphyr. in Stob. *Ecl. Phys.* 41, II. p. 822), μονούσιος, ὁμοούσιος, ὑπερούσιος (Victorin. l. c., Synes. l. c.), προανούσιος (Synes. *Hymn.* l. c., and *Hymn.* 3, p. 322), etc.: and from ἐξουσία the compounds αὐτεξούσιος (frequently, e. g. Diod. xiv. 105) and ὑπεξούσιος (see Steph. *Thes.* s. v., ed. Dindorf & Hase). (2) On the other hand, to the objection that the form should be ἐπούσιος, not ἐπιούσιος, I do not see what valid answer can be given. It has been thought sufficient to adduce in reply such words as ἐπιανδάνω, ἐπίουρα, ἐπιόσσομαι, which however are confined to poetry; and again ἐπιεικής, ἐπίορκος[1], which occur also in

[1] ἐπιόγδοος is also adduced; but in the only passage quoted for this form, Plat. *Tim.* 36 A, B, the best editions have the usual form ἑκτόγδοος.

Digitized by Google

prose. To this list other words might be added, such as ἐπίελπτος, ἐπιέννυμι, ἐπίηρα, ἐπιήρανος, ἐπιΐδμων, ἐπιΐστωρ. But the maintainers of this view have never enquired why the ι of ἐπί, which elsewhere is elided, has been exceptionally retained in such instances. The real fact is, that all these words without exception were originally written with the digamma, ἐπιϜανδάνω, ἐπίϜεικής, ἐπίϜελπτος, ἐπίϜορκος, etc., so that elision was out of the question; and even when the digamma disappeared in pronunciation or was replaced by a simple aspirate, the old forms maintained their ground.

In the present instance no such reason can be pleaded to justify the retention of the ι. The derivation of ἐπιούσιος from ἐπί, οὐσία, can only be maintained on the hypothesis that its form was determined by false analogies, with a view to exhibiting its component parts more clearly. But this hypothesis is not permissible if any other satisfactory explanation of the word can be given; for ἐπιούσιος would then be the single exception to the rule which determines compounds of ἐπί. In fact, the compound ἐπουσιώδης is found occasionally, thus showing that the final vowel of the preposition is naturally elided before οὐσία.

§ 2. *The requirements of the sense.*

It has been shown that etymological considerations favour the root ἰέναι as against εἶναι. It will be necessary in the next place to ask whether the exi-

Digitized by Google

gencies of the sense require us to reverse the decision to which etymology has led us. Is there really any solid objection to our taking *τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον* to mean 'our bread for the coming day'?

One objection, and one only, is urged repeatedly against this explanation. The petition so explained, it is thought, would be a direct violation of the precept which our Lord gives at the close of the chapter, vi. 34 *μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε εἰς τὴν αὔριον*[1]. To this I would reply *first;* that though *ἐπιοῦσα* is most frequently a synonym for *ἡ αὔριον*, yet the words are not coextensive in meaning. If the prayer were said in the evening, no doubt *ἡ ἐπιοῦσα* would be 'the following day, the morrow'; but supposing it to be used at or before dawn, the word would designate the day then breaking. Thus in the Ecclesiazusæ of Aristophanes one of the speakers, after describing the time (ver. 20) *καίτοι πρὸς ὄρθρον γ' ἐστίν* ''tis close on daybreak', exclaims (ver. 105) *νὴ τὴν ἐπιοῦσαν ἡμέραν*, where *τὴν αὔριον* would be quite out of place. This instance shows the different power of the two words, which in some aspects may be said to contrast with each other; for the one implies time *approaching* and the other time *deferred.* But *secondly* (and this seems to be a complete answer to the objection), this argu-

[1] It is astonishing to see with what persistence this worthless argument is repeated. I find it for instance in two of the most recent Theological books which have come into my hands, written from directly opposite points of view, Delitzsch *Brief an die Römer in das Hebräische übersetzt* p. 27 (1870) and Keim *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara* II. p. 279 (1871).

Digitized by Google

ment, if it proves anything, proves too much. If the command *μὴ μεριμνᾶν* is tantamount to a prohibition against prayer for the object about which we are forbidden to be anxious, then not only must we not pray for to-morrow's food, but we must not pray for food at all. For He, who says (ver. 34) *μὴ μεριμνήσητε εἰς τὴν αὔριον*, says also (ver. 25) *μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε*; and on this showing, whatever interpretation we put upon *ἐπιούσιον*, a precept will be violated. The fact is, that, as *μέριμνα* means *anxiety, undue thought* or *care* (see above, p. 170 sq.), prayer to God is not only consistent with the absence of *μέριμνα*, but is a means of driving it away. One Apostle tells us (1 Pet. v. 7) to 'cast all our anxiety (*μέριμνα*) on God, for He careth (*αὐτῷ μέλει*) for us.' Another directs us 'not to be anxious about any matter (*μηδὲν μεριμνᾶτε*) but in every thing with prayer and supplication joined with thanksgiving to make our desires known unto God (Phil. iv. 6).' These injunctions we fulfil when we use the petition in the Lord's Prayer in a proper spirit. At the same time, even in our prayers we are directed specially to the needs of 'the coming day,' for in the very act of asking for distant material blessings there is danger of exciting in ourselves this *μέριμνα* which it is our duty to crush[1].

[1] The moral bearing of this petition is well put by S. Basil (*Reg. brev. tract.* cclii, II. p. 500), though he wrongly interprets the word itself; *ὁ ἐργαζόμενος μνημονεύων τοῦ κυρίου λέγοντος Μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε ἢ τί πίητε...τὸν ἐπιούσιον ἄρτον, τουτέστι τὸν πρὸς*

Digitized by Google

On the other hand, if *ἐπιούσιον* be derived from *ἐπί, οὐσία*, we have the choice between the two senses of *οὐσία*, (1) 'subsistence,' and (2) 'essence, being.' Of these the latter must be rejected at once. It is highly improbable that a term of transcendental philosophy should have been chosen, and a strange compound invented for insertion in a prayer intended for every day use. Indeed nothing could well be conceived more alien to the simplicity of the Gospel-teaching, than such an expression as *ἐπιούσιος*, meaning 'suited to' or 'conducive to the *οὐσία*, the essential being.' If therefore this derivation from *οὐσία* is tenable at all, we must be prepared to assign to it the more homely meaning, 'subsistence,' so that *ἐπιούσιος* will be 'sufficient to sustain us,' 'enough for our absolute wants, but not enough for luxury.' Such a sense in itself would meet the requirements of the passage. Only it does not seem likely that a strange word, which arrives at this meaning in an indirect way, should have been invented to express a very simple idea for which the Greek language had already more than one equivalent. Nor indeed is it a natural sense for the word to bear. In Porphyr. *Isag.* 16, and elsewhere, *ἐπουσιώδης* is used to signify *accidental*, as opposed to *essential*, denoting what is *superadded to the οὐσία*; and if such a compound as *ἐπιούσιος* (from *οὐσία*) were possible, it ought to have a similar meaning.

τὴν ἐφήμερον ζωὴν τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἡμῶν χρησιμεύοντα, οὐχ ἑαυτῷ ἐπιτρέπει ἀλλὰ τῷ θεῷ ἐντυγχάνει περὶ τούτου, κ.τ.λ.

Digitized by Google

§ 3. *The tenor of tradition.*

Hitherto we have seen no sufficient reason for abandoning the derivation from ἰέναι, while on the other hand serious difficulties are encountered by adopting the alternative and deriving the word from εἶναι. It remains to enquire how far this result is borne out by tradition.

Tholuck, discussing the two derivations of ἐπιούσιος, from εἶναι and ἰέναι respectively, states, 'The oldest and most widely spread is the former': and Suicer, mentioning the derivation from ἡ ἐπιοῦσα, adds, 'Nemo ex veteribus ita explicat.' I hope to show that such statements are the very reverse of the truth; that, so far as our evidence goes, the derivation from ἰέναι is decidedly the more ancient; and that, though the other prevailed widely among Greek interpreters after Origen, yet it never covered so wide an area as its elder rival. I shall take the great divisions of the Church as distinguished by their several languages, and investigate the traditional sense assigned to the word in each.

1. In the *Greek* Church the first testimony is that of ORIGEN (*de Orat.* 27, l. c.). He himself derives the word from οὐσία, adducing περιούσιος as an analogy. This analogy, as we have already seen, is false: for, whereas ἐπὶ loses the final vowel in composition, περὶ retains it; so that while the one compound would

Digitized by Google

be περιούσιος, the other would be ἐπούσιος. Thus derived, the word signifies according to Origen τὸν εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν ἡμῶν συμβαλλόμενον ἄρτον. It is the spiritual bread which nourishes the spiritual being, ὁ τῇ φύσει τῇ λογικῇ καταλληλότατος καὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ αὐτῇ συγγενής κ.τ.λ. This view Origen supports by quoting other passages where the heavenly bread is mentioned, and at the close of the discussion he adds (p. 249 C); 'Some one will say that ἐπιούσιον is formed [l. κατεσχηματίσθαι] from ἐπιέναι; so that we are bidden to ask for the bread which belongs to the future life (τὸν οἰκεῖον τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος), that God may anticipate and give it to us even now, so that what shall be given as it were to-morrow may be given us to-day (ὥστε τὸ οἱονεὶ αὔριον δοθησόμενον σήμερον ἡμῖν δοθῆναι); the future life being represented by *to-morrow*, and the present by *to-day:* but the former acceptation is better in my judgment, etc.' Thus the earliest notice among Greek-speaking Christians reveals a conflict between the two derivations. It is true that in either case Origen contemplates a spiritual rather than a literal interpretation of the bread, but this fact accords with the general principles of the Alexandrian school from which the notice emanates; for this school is given to importing a mystical sense into the simple language of the Gospel. This ulterior question does not affect the derivation of the word.

So far as I am acquainted with the language of Origen elsewhere, his mode of speaking here is quite consistent with the supposition that he himself first

Digitized by Google

started the derivation from *εἶναι, οὐσία.* At all events this supposition accords with his fondness for importing a reference to 'absolute being' into the language of the Apostles and Evangelists elsewhere, as for instance when he interprets *τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν* (omitting the words *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*) in Ephes. i. 1, and *ἵνα τὰ ὄντα καταργήσῃ* in 1 Cor. i. 28, in this sense (see Cramer's *Catena* on Ephes. l. c.). A derivation which transferred the word *ἐπιούσιος* at once from the domain of the material to the domain of the supra-sensual would have a strong attraction for Origen's mind. Still it must remain a pure hypothesis that he himself invented this derivation. He may have got it from one of his predecessors, Pantænus or Clement: but at all events it bears the impress of the Alexandrian school. On the other hand his own language shows that the other etymology (from *ἐπιέναι*) had its supporters. How few or how numerous they were, the vagueness of his expression will not allow us to speculate. It is only when we come to the Versions that we find solid ground for assuming that in the earliest age this was the prevailing view.

The next Greek writer whose opinion is known was also an Alexandrian. The great ATHANASIUS (*de Incarn.* § 16, I. p. 706) derives the word from *ἐπιέναι,* but gives it a theological meaning: 'Elsewhere He calls the Holy Spirit heavenly bread, saying, *Give us this day τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον*[1], for He

[1] The Benedictine editor translates *ἐπιούσιον* here by *supersubstantialem* after Jerome, though the context of S. Athanasius is directly

Digitized by Google

taught us in His prayer to ask in the present life for *τὸν ἐπιούσιον ἄρτον*, that is *the future*, whereof we have the first-fruits in the present life, partaking of it through[1] the flesh of the Lord, as He himself said, *The bread, which I shall give, is my flesh*, etc.' This is exactly the account of the word which Origen rejects.

To those however, who have studied the early history of Biblical interpretation, it will be no surprise to find that Origen's explanation of this word exerted a very wide and lasting influence. It is a common phenomenon to find nearly all the Greek expositors following him, even in cases where his interpretation is almost demonstrably wrong. If his explanations had the good fortune to be adopted by the Antiochene school, as was frequently the case, they passed unchallenged and established themselves in the Church at large. In this particular instance the procedure of the Antiochene school would appear to have been characteristic, both in its agreement with and in its departure from Origen. While accepting his derivation, they seem to have substituted a realistic for his mystical sense of *ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος*. The adjective thus explained becomes 'for our material subsistence,' and not 'for our spiritual being.'

The views of the earliest representatives of the

against this. At the same time Athanasius arrives at the same mystical meaning of *τὸν ἄρτον τὸν ἐπιούσιον* as Jerome, though through a different derivation.

[1] *διὰ* is absent from some texts but seems to be correct. If it is omitted the sense will be 'partaking of the flesh'.

Digitized by Google

Antiochene school on this point are not recorded. But they may perhaps be assumed not only from the general tenor of later interpretations in this school (from Chrysostom downward) but also from the opinions of the Cappadocian fathers.

In the treatise of GREGORY NYSSEN, *de Orat. Domin.* iv, I. p. 745, this view is stated very explicitly: 'We are ordered,' he says, 'to ask for what is sufficient for the preservation of our bodily subsistence (*τὸ πρὸς τὴν συντήρησιν τῆς σωματικῆς οὐσίας*).' The same interpretation is adopted by his brother BASIL (*Reg. brev. tract.* cclii, II. p. 500), who explains *τὸν ἐπιούσιον ἄρτον* as that 'which is serviceable for our daily life for our subsistence (*τὸν πρὸς τὴν ἐφήμερον ζωὴν τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἡμῶν χρησιμεύοντα*).' The same derivation, though not quite the same meaning, is assigned to it also by CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, *Catech.* xxiii (*Mystag.* v). 15, p. 329; 'This holy bread is *ἐπιούσιος*, being appointed for the subsistence (or substance) of the soul (*ἐπὶ τὴν οὐσίαν τῆς ψυχῆς κατατασσόμενος*). This bread does not go into the belly nor is it cast out into the draught, but is distributed into the whole of thy complex frame (*εἰς πᾶσάν σου τὴν σύστασιν ἀναδίδοται*) for the benefit of body and soul'; where an application chiefly though not exclusively spiritual is given to *οὐσία*. Again, S. CHRYSOSTOM, *de Ang. Port. etc.* 5[1], III. p. 35, interprets *ἐπιούσιον* 'which passes to the sub-

[1] It is right to mention that the authorship of this Homily has been questioned; see the preface in Montfaucon's edition.

Digitized by Google

stance of the body (*ἐπὶ τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ σώματος διαβαίνοντα*) and is able to compact (*συγκροτῆσαι*) this'; but elsewhere, in his Homily on S. John (xliii. § 2, VIII. p. 257) he explains *τοῦ ἄρτου τοῦ ἐπιουσίου, τουτέστι, τοῦ καθημερινοῦ*; while on S. Matthew, where the passage itself occurs, he expresses himself in such a vague way, as if he were purposely evading a difficulty (xix. § 5, VII. p. 251 sq.), *τί ἐστι τὸν ἄρτον τὸν ἐπιούσιον; τὸν ἐφήμερον...δεῖται [ἡ φύσις] τροφῆς τῆς ἀναγκαίας...ὑπὲρ ἄρτου μόνον ἐκέλευσε τὴν εὐχὴν ποιεῖσθαι, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἄρτου τοῦ ἐφημέρου, ὥστε μὴ ὑπὲρ τῆς αὔριον μεριμνᾶν· διὰ τοῦτο προσέθηκε, τὸν ἄρτον τὸν ἐπιούσιον, τουτέστι, τὸν ἐφήμερον· καὶ οὐδὲ τούτῳ ἠρκέσθη τῷ ῥήματι ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕτερον μετὰ τοῦτο προσεθήκεν, εἰπών, δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον· ὥστε μὴ περαιτέρω συντρίβειν ἑαυτοὺς τῇ φροντίδι τῆς ἐπιούσης ἡμέρας*, where he shelters himself under the vagueness of *ἐφήμερος* without explaining how he arrives at this meaning, and where the somewhat ambiguous words 'not to afflict ourselves *further* with the thought of the coming (*ἐπιούσης*) day' seem to allow, if not to suggest, the derivation from *ἐπιοῦσα*. In a later passage of the same Homilies (lv. § 5, p. 562) and in his Exposition of Psalm cxxvii (v. p. 364) he again quotes this petition, but avoids an explanation; in his Homilies on Genesis (liv. § 5, IV. p. 530 sq.) he adduces it as setting the proper limits to our desire for temporal goods, *τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον, ἀντὶ τοῦ, τὴν τῆς ἡμέρας τροφήν*; while on Philippians iv. 19 (*Hom.* xv. § 4, XI. p. 316), com-

Digitized by Google

menting on the words πληρώσει πᾶσαν χρείαν ὑμῶν, he adds 'so as not to be in want but to have what is needful (τὰ πρὸς χρείαν), for Christ also put this in His prayer, when teaching us, τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον.' Thus he seems throughout to be wavering between the meanings *daily* and *necessary*, i.e. between the derivations from ἰέναι and εἶναι, though he tends towards the latter. Again THEODORET on Phil. iv. 19, following Chrysostom, quotes this petition as warranting S. Paul in asking for his converts τὴν κατὰ τὸν παρόντα βίον χρείαν.

Somewhat later CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA on Luke xi. 3 (*Mai*, II. p. 266) thus comments on ἐπιούσιον; 'Some say that it is that which shall come and shall be given in the future life;.....but if this were true.....why do they add, *Give us day by day*? For one may see likewise by these words that they make their petition for daily food; and we must understand by ἐπιούσιον what is sufficient (τὸν αὐτάρκη) etc.[1]'

Later Greek writers contented themselves with repeating one or more of the interpretations given by their predecessors. Thus DAMASCENE (*Orthod. Fid.* iv. 13, I. p. 272 Lequien) says, οὗτος ὁ ἄρτος ἐστὶν ἡ ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἄρτου, ὃς ἐστιν ὁ ἐπιούσιος· τὸ γὰρ ἐπιούσιον δηλοῖ ἢ τὸν μέλλοντα, τουτέστι, τὸν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, ἢ τὸν πρὸς συντήρησιν τῆς οὐσίας ἡμῶν λαμβανόμενον; and THEOPHYLACT (on

[1] In *Glaphyr. in Exod.* ii, I. p. 286, ed. Auberti, he explains this petition as equivalent to asking for τὰ εἰς ζωὴν ἐπιτήδεια.

Digitized by Google

Luke xi. 3) explains it *τὸν ἐπὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἡμῶν καὶ τῇ συστάσει τῆς ζωῆς συμβαλλόμενον, οὐ τὸν περιττὸν πάντως ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀναγκαῖον* (see also on Matt. vi. 11)[1].

2. From the *Aramaic* Christians, the testimony in favour of the derivation from *ἐπιέναι* is stronger.

We learn from S. Jerome (*in Matth.* vi. 11, VII. p. 34), that in the GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS the word *ἐπιούσιον*, which he translated 'supersubstantialem,' was rendered by Mahar (מחר), 'quod dicitur *crastinum*, ut sit sensus, *Panem nostrum crastinum*, id est *futurum, da nobis hodie.*'

Whatever view be adopted of the origin of this Apocryphal Gospel, its evidence has the highest value in this particular instance. Of its great antiquity no question can be entertained. It can hardly have been written much later than the close of the first century. It was regarded as an authoritative document by the Judaizing Christians of Palestine. It adhered very closely to the Gospel of S. Matthew, and was even thought by some to be the Hebrew (i. e. Aramaic) original of this Gospel; though the variations are too considerable to admit this simple solution. On the whole we may conclude with high probability that its traditions were not derived through the Greek but came from some Aramaic source or sources—whether from an oral Gospel, or from written notes put together for catechetical purposes, or from the Aramaic copy of S. Matthew's

[1] A number of different interpretations are huddled together by an anonymous writer in Origen, *Op.* I. p. 910 (ed. Delarue).

Digitized by Google

Gospel altered to suit the purposes of the writer. But even if it were derived from our Greek Gospels, its interpretation of *ἐπιούσιον* would still have the greatest weight as proceeding from Palestine at this very early date. In a familiar expression in the most familiar of all the Evangelical records it is not unreasonable to assume that the tradition would be preserved at the close of the Apostolic age unimpaired in the vernacular language of our Lord and his disciples[1].

From the Gospel according to the Hebrews, we turn to another Aramaic source, emanating from a different quarter, the CURETONIAN SYRIAC Version of the New Testament.

In Matt. vi. 11, this version has:

ܠܠܚܡܢ ܕܣܝܢ ܝܘܡܢ ܗܒ ܠܢ.

'And-our-bread continual of-the-day give-to-us.'

In Luke xi. 3:

ܠܠܚܡܢ ܕܣܝܢ ܕܟܠ ܝܘܡ ܗܒ ܠܢ.

'And-give to-us the-bread continual of-every-day.'

Here the temporal sense 'continual,' given to *ἐπιούσιον*, connects it with *ἐπιέναι*, whether through *ἐπιοῦσα*, 'for the coming day,' and so 'daily, con-

[1] It is unnecessary here to discuss the question to what extent Greek was spoken in Palestine at the Christian era. Even if with Dr. Roberts, in his instructive work *Discussions on the Gospels*, we take the view that the Palestinian Jews were bi-lingual, the argument in the text will still hold good.

Digitized by Google

stant,' or more directly, 'ever coming,' and so 'perpetual'[1].

When however we turn from the Curetonian to the later revision, the PESHITO SYRIAC, we find that the influence of the Greek interpreters has been at work meanwhile. The word 'necessary' is substituted for 'constant,' the *qualitative* sense for the *temporal*, i. e. the derivation from *εἶναι* for the derivation from *ἰέναι*.

In Matt. vi. 11 of this Version, the petition runs,

ܗܒ ܠܝ ܠܫܪܟ ܕܡܬܩܢܐ ܕܡܬܟܢ.

'Give to-us the-bread of-our-necessity this-day.'

In Luke xi. 3:

ܗܒ ܠܝ ܠܫܪܟ ܕܡܬܩܢܐ ܟܠ ܝܘܡ.

'Give to-us the-bread of-our-necessity every-day.'

This is only one of the many instances where the Peshito betrays the influences of the fourth century whether in the text or in the interpretation[2].

In the still later HARCLEAN VERSION (A.D. 616) again this same interpretation is adopted in both passages, though slightly varied in form.

[1] Cureton compares Num. iv. 7 לחם התמיד, translated in the Syriac ܠܫܪܟ ܕܡܬܬܩܢ. His own speculations respecting the original reading in S. Matthew seem both unnecessary and untenable.

[2] Prof. Wright informs me that he has not found any variation in the earliest MSS of the Peshito in the British Museum, belonging to the 5th, 6th, and 7th centuries.

Digitized by Google

In Matt. vi. 11:

ܠܚܡܐ ܕܣܘܢܩܢܢ ܗܒ ܠܢ ܝܘܡܢ ܕܢܝܢ.

'The-bread of-us that necessary give to-us this-day.'

In Luke xi. 3:

ܠܚܡܐ ܕܣܘܢܩܢܢ ܝܘܡܢ ܗܒ ܠܢ ܕܝܘܡܐ.

'The-bread of-necessity of-us give to-us this-day:'

with a v. l. ܠܚܡ ܕܡܬܐ ܕܝܘܡܐ (i. e. *τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν*) for ܠܚܡܐ (*σήμερον*).

Again, the JERUSALEM SYRIAC, which was perhaps translated from a Greek Lectionary, and can hardly be earlier than the 5th century, also appears to derive *ἐπιούσιος* from *εἶναι, οὐσία*, but gives it a different sense, apparently confusing it with *περιούσιος*, as S. Jerome does.

In Matt. vi. 11 it has,

ܠܚܡ ܕܥܘܬܪܢ ܗܒ ܠܢ ܝܘܡܢ.

'Our-bread of-opulence (or 'abundance') give to-us this-day,' (I. p. 234, ed. Miniscalchi-Erizzo). The corresponding passage in S. Luke is not extant in this Version.

Thus among the Aramaic Christians the earliest tradition, which has reached us by two distinct channels, connects the word with *ἐπιέναι*: while in the later Versions, after the influence of the Greek interpreters had made itself felt, this traditional sense has been displaced by the derivation from *οὐσία*.

It will be seen hereafter how the later rendering

Digitized by Google

substituted by S. Jerome failed to suppress the traditional *quotidianum* of the Old Latin. In the same way the ܡܬܝܬܝ of the Old (Curetonian) Syriac, though it does not show equal vitality, occurs occasionally and still survives long after the later Revision of the New Testament, which we call the Peshito, had superseded the earlier Version or Versions. Thus in the Syriac recension of the *Acts of Thomas*—which must be a very ancient work, for it has a distinctly Gnostic character—the Lord's Prayer is quoted towards the end, and the petition in question runs

ܠܚܡܐ ܕܡܬܝܬܝ ܕܝܘܡܢ ܠܝ ܗܒ

closely following this Version[1]. Again, in one of the poems of Jacob of Sarug, who died A.D. 521, (Zingerle's *Monumenta Syriaca* p. 31, Innsbrück 1869), it is said of the patriarch Jacob (see Gen. xxviii. 20) that he 'prayed the prayer which our Lord taught.

ܠ.. ܗܒ ܠܚܡܐ ܕܡܬܝܬܝ ܕܝܘܡܢ

The-bread continual of-the-day give to-me.'

and lower down he again repeats the characteristic words:

.ܠܚܡܐ ܕܡܬܝܬܝ ܕܝܘܡܢ[2]

[1] These Acts are found in a British Museum MS, *Add.* 14, 645, and have been recently edited by Prof. Wright, in his *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, 1871. The text of the Lord's Prayer in these Acts agrees generally with the Curetonian Version as against the Peshito.

[2] This passage was pointed out to me by Mr Bensly of the Cambridge University Library. I had also hoped that I might find this petition quoted in the works of one of the earlier Syriac writers, Aphraates

Digitized by Google

This rendering of τὸν ἄρτον τὸν ἐπιούσιον is found also in an *Exposition of the Lord's Prayer* by the same writer, preserved in the MS Brit. Mus. *Add.* 17, 157 (dated A.G. 876 = A.D. 565), in which the expression is repeated not less than three times, fol. 48 *a*, 49 *a*[1].

3. The testimony of the *Egyptian* Versions again is highly valuable, both as preserving a very ancient tradition (for it would seem that they must both be assigned to the close of the second or beginning of the third century), and as representing a distinct and isolated section of the Church.

The MEMPHITIC, the version of Lower Egypt, and the THEBAIC, the version of Upper Egypt, agree in the derivation from ἰέναι; and their agreement is the more valuable, inasmuch as their general character shows them to be independent the one of the other.

or Ephrem, but my search has not been attended with success. An indirect reference in Ephrem (*Op.* VI. p. 642) omits the word in question.

لسحكم ٢٠٠٠٠٠ سعصم لم ٢٠٠٠٠٠ ٢٠٠٠٠٠
حيلهم.

'The bread of the day shall suffice thee, as thou hast learnt in the Prayer.' At the same time Ephrem agrees with the Curetonian against the Peshito in ٢٠٠٠٠٠, so that it seems *probable* he used the Curetonian Version. Prof. Wright at my request examined several Syriac Service-books in the British Museum Library. He reports that all the volumes which he examined are Jacobite, and that 'the reading invariably agrees with the Peshito text of Matt. vi. 11. They belong to the 9th, 10th, and 11th centuries.'

[1] These references were communicated to me by Prof. Wright.

Digitized by Google

The Memphitic version has:

In Matt. vi. 11:

ⲡⲉⲛⲱⲓⲕ ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲁⲥⲧⲓ ⲙⲏⲓⲥ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲙ̀ⲫⲟⲟⲩ.

'Our bread of-to-morrow give-it to-us to-day.'

In Luke xi. 3:

ⲡⲉⲛⲱⲓⲕ ⲉⲑⲛⲏⲟⲩ ⲙⲏⲓⲥ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲙ̀ⲙⲏⲛⲓ.

'Our bread that-cometh give-it to-us daily.'

The Thebaic Version:

In Matt. vi. 11:

ⲡⲉⲛⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲉⲧⲛⲏⲩ ⲛ̀ⲧⲟⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲟⲩ.

'Our bread that-cometh give-thou it to us to-day.'

The corresponding passage of S. Luke in this Version is not preserved.

Here we have a choice of two translations, both founded on the same derivation, the one through *ἐπιοῦσα*, the other directly from *ἐπιέναι*.

In all the Coptic (i.e. Memphitic) Service-books which I have seen, the rendering of *ἐπιούσιον* is ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲁⲥⲧⲓ, 'of to-morrow.'

4. The *Latin* Churches preserve a still more ancient tradition. The OLD LATIN Version, which dates certainly from the second century, and not improbably, so far as regards the Gospels, from the first half of the century, renders *ἐπιούσιον* by *quotidianum* in both Evangelists. Of this rendering there can be no doubt. It is found in the extant manuscripts of the Old Latin Version in both places. It is

Digitized by Google

quoted moreover by the early Latin Fathers, Tertullian (*de Orat.* 6) and Cyprian (*de Orat.* p. 104, Fell). Though both these fathers are commenting especially on the Lord's Prayer, and both adopt a spiritual sense of the petition, as referring to Christ the living bread and to the eucharistic feast, yet they comment on 'quotidianum' from this point of view, and seem to be unaware that any other rendering is possible.

At length in the fourth century the influence of the scholastic interpretation, put forward by Origen and the Greek Fathers, makes itself felt in Latin writers. The first semblance of any such influence is found in Juvencus, the Latin poet, who wrote a metrical history of the Gospel about A.D. 330—335. He renders the words

> Vitalisque hodie sancti *substantia* panis
> Proveniat nobis.
>
> *Evang. Hist.* i. 631.

Here however, though the coincidence is curious, no inference can safely be drawn from the occurrence of 'substantia'; since Juvencus elsewhere uses the word with a genitive as a convenient periphrasis to eke out his metre, without any special significance; e.g. i. 415, 'substantia panis' (Matt. iv. 4); i. 510, 'salis substantia' (Matt. v. 13); ii. 420, 'vocis substantia' (Matt. ix. 32); ii. 524, 'animæ substantia' (Matt. xi. 5); ii. 677, 'credendi substantia' (John v. 38); iii. 668, 'arboris substantia' (Matt. xxi. 21).

Digitized by Google

In VICTORINUS the Rhetorician, who was acquainted with the Greek commentators, the first distinct traces of this interpretation in the Latin Church are found. In his treatise *against Arius*, completed about the year 365, he writes (i. 31, *Bibl. Vet. Patr.* VIII. p. 163, ed. Galland.): 'Unde deductum ἐπιούσιον quam a substantia? *Da panem nobis* ἐπιούσιον *hodiernum.* Quoniam Jesus vita est, et corpus ipsius vita est, corpus autem panis...Significat ἐπιούσιον ex ipsa aut in ipsa substantia, hoc est, vitæ panem.' And again (ii. 8, ib. p. 177): 'ἐπιούσιον ἄρτον, ex eadem οὐσία panem, id est, de vita Dei, consubstantialem vitam...Græcum igitur Evangelium habet ἐπιούσιον, quod denominatum est a substantia, et utique Dei substantia: hoc Latini vel non intelligentes vel non valentes exprimere non potuerunt dicere, et tantummodo *quotidianum* posuerunt, non ἐπιούσιον.' Setting himself to defend the ὁμοούσιον of the Nicene creed against the charge of novelty, Victorinus seizes with avidity a derivation of ἐπιούσιον which furnishes him with a sort of precedent.

Again, in S. AMBROSE we find distinct references to this derivation. In a treatise ascribed to this father (*de Sacram.* v. 4. § 24, II. p. 378) we read, 'Quare ergo in oratione dominica, quæ postea sequitur, ait *Panem nostrum?* Panem quidem sed ἐπιούσιον, hoc est, *supersubstantialem.* Non iste panis est qui vadit in corpus; sed ille panis vitæ æternæ qui animæ nostræ substantiam fulcit. Ideo Græce ἐπιούσιος dicitur: Latinus autem hunc panem *quotidianum*

Digitized by Google

dixit [quem Græci dicunt *advenientem*][1]; quia Græci dicunt *τὴν ἐπιούσαν ἡμέραν* advenientem diem. Ergo quod Latinus dixit et quod Græcus, utrumque utile videtur. Græcus utrumque uno sermone significavit, Latinus *quotidianum* dixit. Si quotidianus est panis, cur post annum illum sumis, quemadmodum Græci in oriente facere consuerunt? Accipe quotidie, quod quotidie tibi prosit etc.' The writer seems here to combine the two derivations of *ἐπιούσιον*, as though the word could have a double etymology. At least I cannot interpret 'Græcus utrumque uno sermone significavit' in any other way[2]. The authorship of the treatise however is open to question, as it contains some suspicious statements and expressions. But whoever may have been the writer, the work appears to be early. If he owed the expression *supersubstantialis* to S. Jerome's revision, as was probably the case, even this is consistent with the Ambrosian authorship, as several of this father's works were written after S. Jerome had completed the Gospels.

Again, in an unquestioned treatise of S. Ambrose (*de Fide* iii. 15. § 127, II. p. 519) written in the years 377, 378, this father, defending the word *ὁμοούσιον* against the Arians, uses the same argument as Victorinus: 'An negare possunt *οὐσίαν* lectam, cum et panem *ἐπιούσιον* Dominus dixerit et Moyses scrip-

[1] The words in brackets are omitted in many MSS, and seem to be out of place.

[2] Pfeiffer in the *Thesaur. Theol. Philol.* II. p. 117 (Amstel. 1702) explains 'utrumque uno sermone significavit' by 'crastinum scil. dicendo, hodiernum includens diem,' which seems to me meaningless.

Digitized by Google

serit ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος? Aut quid est οὐσία, vel unde dicta, nisi οὖσα ἀεί, quod semper maneat? Qui enim est, et est semper, Deus est; et ideo manens semper οὐσία dicitur divina substantia. Propterea ἐπιούσιος panis, quod ex verbi substantia substantiam virtutis manentis cordi et animæ subministret; scriptum est enim, *Et panis confirmat cor hominis* (Ps. ciii. 15).' The etymological views of a writer who derives οὐσία from οὖσα ἀεί can have no value in themselves. The notice is only important as showing that the derivation from οὐσία was gaining ground. At the same time, like the passage of Victorinus, it suggests a motive which would induce many to accept the etymology offered, as furnishing a ready answer to an Arian objection.

When S. JEROME (about A.D. 383) revised the Latin of the New Testament, he substituted *supersubstantialem* for *quotidianum* in the text of S. Matthew; but, either prevented by scruples from erasing a cherished expression from the Latin Bibles, or feeling some misgiving about the correctness of his own rendering, he allowed *quotidianum* to stand in S. Luke. Altogether his language is vague and undecided, whenever he has occasion to mention the word. In his Commentary on the Epistle to Titus (*Op.* VII. p. 726), written about A.D. 387, he thus expresses himself: 'Unde et illud, quod in evangelio secundum Latinos interpretes scriptum est *Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie*, melius in Græco habetur *Panem nostrum* ἐπιούσιον, id est *præcipuum*,

Digitized by Google

egregium, peculiarem[1], eum videlicet qui de cælo descendens ait (Joh. vi. 51), *Ego sum panis qui de cælo descendi.* Absit quippe ut nos, qui in crastinum cogitare prohibemur, de pane isto qui post paululum concoquendus et abjiciendus est in secessum in prece dominica rogare jubeamur. Nec multum differt inter ἐπιούσιον et περιούσιον; præpositio enim tantummodo est mutata, non verbum. Quidam ἐπιούσιον existimant in oratione dominica panem dictum, quod super omnes οὐσίας sit, hoc est super universas substantias. Quod si accipitur, non multum ab eo sensu differt quem exposuimus. Quidquid enim egregium est et præcipuum, extra omnia est et super omnia.' And similarly in his Commentary on S. Matthew (*Op.* VII. p. 34), written a few years afterwards (A.D. 398): 'Quod nos *supersubstantialem* expressimus, in Græco habetur ἐπιούσιον, quod verbum Septuaginta interpretes περιούσιον frequentissime transferunt..... Possumus supersubstantialem panem et aliter intellegere, qui super omnes substantias sit et universas superet creaturas. Alii simpliciter putant, secundum Apostoli sermonem dicentis *Habentes victum et vestitum his contenti simus,* de præsenti tantum cibo sanctos curam agere.' Hitherto he is apparently consistent with himself in connecting the word with οὐσία; but in a later work, the Commentary on Ezekiel (*Op.* V. p. 209), written from A.D. 411—414,

[1] It thus appears that the sense which S. Jerome himself attaches to his rendering *supersubstantialem* is different from that which some theologians have assigned to it.

Digitized by Google

he says, 'Melius est ut intelligamus panem justi eum esse qui dicit, *Ego sum panis vivus qui de cælo descendi*, et quem in Oratione nobis tribui deprecamur, *Panem nostrum substantivum*, sive *superventurum, da nobis*, ut quem postea semper accepturi sumus, in præsenti sæculo quotidie mereamur accipere.' And in a still later work against the Pelagians, written about A.D. 415, he speaks with the same uncertainty (iii. 15, II. p. 800); 'Sic docuit Apostolos suos ut quotidie in corporis illius sacrificio credentes audeant loqui *Pater noster, etc.....Panem quotidianum*, sive *super omnes substantias*, venturum Apostoli deprecantur ut digni sint assumtione corporis Christi.' In one point only is he consistent throughout. He insists on a spiritual, as opposed to a literal, interpretation of the bread.

The indecision or the scruple or the carelessness, which led Jerome to retain *quotidianum* in one Evangelist while he removed it from another, bore strange fruit. Jerome's revised Latin Version became the Bible of the Western Churches. The knowledge of the Greek tongue died out. The fact that the same word ἐπιούσιον occurs in both Gospels passed out of memory. The difference which was found in the Latin Vulgate came to be regarded as a difference in the language of the Evangelists themselves. As such it is commented upon by the most learned Latin writers in successive ages. So it is treated even by his own younger contemporary Cassianus who, though himself not ignorant of Greek, yet in a treatise written

Digitized by Google

soon after the death of S. Jerome writes (*Collat.* ix. 21), '*Panem nostrum ἐπιούσιον,* id est, supersubstantialem, *da nobis hodie:* quod alius evangelista *quotidianum.*' So again it is taken by Anselm in the 11th or 12th century (*Comm. in Matth.*), by Nicolas of Lyra in the 14th (*Comm. in Matth.*), and by Dionysius Carthusianus in the 15th (*Enarr. in Matth.*)[1]; all of whom remark on the different epithets used by S. Matthew and S. Luke.

But the most remarkable instance of this blunder is furnished by a controversy between the two foremost men of their time, S. Bernard and Abelard. The Abbot of Clairvaux, having occasion to visit the convent of the Paraclete of which Heloise was abbess, observed that in repeating the Lord's Prayer at the daily hours a change was made in the usual form, the word 'supersubstantialem' being substituted for 'quotidianum.' As Heloise had made this change under the direction of Abelard, she communicated the complaint to him. Upon this he wrote a letter of defence to S. Bernard, which is extant (P. Abaelardi *Opera* 1. p. 618, ed. Cousin). He pleads that the form in S. Matthew must be more authentic than the form in S. Luke—the former having been an Apostle and heard the words as uttered, the latter having derived his information at second hand—'de ipso fonte Matthæus, de rivulo fontis Lucas est potatus.' Hence S. Matthew's form is more complete and contains seven

[1] See Pfeiffer l. c. p. 119 sq.

Digitized by Google

petitions, while S. Luke's has only five. For this reason the Church in her offices has rightly preferred S. Matthew's form to S. Luke's. 'What may have been the reason therefore,' he proceeds, 'that while we retain the rest of S. Matthew's words, we change one only, saying *quotidianum* for *supersubstantialem*[1], let him state who can, if indeed it is sufficient to state it. For the word *quotidianum* does not seem to express the excellence of this bread, like *supersubstantialem*; and it seems to be an act of no slight presumption to correct the words of an Apostle, and to make up one prayer out of two Evangelists, in

[1] We may pardon the mistake of Abelard more readily, when we find that a learned modern historian, commenting on the incident, is guilty of a still greater error. Milman (*History of Latin Christianity* III. p. 262, ed. 2) remarks on this dispute: 'The question was the clause in the Lord's prayer *our daily bread* or *our bread day by day*.' Here two wholly different things are confused together. (1) S. Matthew and S. Luke alike have ἐπιούσιον. This was rendered *quotidianum* in both Evangelists in the Old Latin, as it is rendered *daily* in both in our English Version. But Jerome by substituting *supersubstantialem* in S. Matthew and retaining *quotidianum* in S. Luke made an artificial variation, which misled Abelard. Meanwhile the *quotidianum* of the Old Latin in S. Matthew maintained its place in the Service books, and puzzled Abelard by its presence. Abelard's remarks are confined solely to the epithet attached to ἄρτον. (2) There is a real difference between S. Matthew and S. Luke in another part of the sentence, the former having σήμερον *this day*, the latter τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν *day by day*. This distinction was obliterated by the Old Latin, which took the false reading σήμερον in S. Luke and so gave *hodie* in both Evangelists. It reappears again in the original Vulgate of Jerome, which has *hodie* in S. Matthew and *cotidie* in S. Luke (though once more obliterated in the Clementine recension). Of this difference Dean Milman seems to have had some not very clear idea and to have confused it with the dispute about ἐπιούσιον, but Abelard does not mention it at all.

Digitized by Google

such a manner that neither seems to be sufficient in respect of it (the prayer), and to recite it in a form in which it was neither spoken by the Lord nor written by any of the Evangelists. Especially when in all other portions of their writings which are read in Church, their words are kept separate, however much they may differ in respect of completeness or incompleteness (impermixta sunt verba eorum, quacunque perfectione vel imperfectione discrepent). Therefore, if any one blames me for innovating in this matter, let him consider whether blame is not rather due to the person who presumed out of two prayers written in old times to make up one new prayer, which deserves rather to be called his own than an Evangelist's (non tam evangelicam quam suam dicendam). Lastly, the discernment of the Greeks, whose authority (as S. Ambrose saith) is greater, hath, owing to the aforesaid reasons, as I suppose, brought the prayer of S. Matthew alone into common use, saying, τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον, which is translated *Panem nostrum supersubstantialem.*' Strange it is, that, though quoting the Greek words of S. Matthew (apparently however at second hand), Abelard did not take the trouble to consult the original of S. Luke, but here, as elsewhere[1], allowed

[1] Abelard uses similar language elsewhere, *In Dieb. Rogat. Serm.* Op. I. p. 471; 'Non sine admiratione videtur accipiendum quod apud nos in consuetudinem ecclesiæ venerit ut quum orationem dominicam in verbis Matthæi frequentemus, qui eam, ut dictum est, perfectius scripserit, unum ejus verbum cæteris omnibus retentis commutemus, pro *supersubstantialem* scilicet, quod ipse posuit, dicentes *quotidianum*,

Digitized by Google

himself to follow the Vulgate implicitly. Strange too, but less strange, that he should not have recognised in the *quotidianum* of the Church Services the remnant of an older Version, which in this instance Jerome's Revision had been powerless to displace. We do not hear that S. Bernard refuted his pertinacious adversary by exposing his error. It is improbable that he possessed the learning necessary for this purpose, for in learning at least he was no match for his brilliant opponent. He probably fell back on the usage of the Church, and refused to cross weapons with so formidable an adversary.

Yet, notwithstanding such notices as these, the marvel is that Jerome's *supersubstantialis* took so little hold upon the Latin Church at large. When after some generations his revised Vulgate superseded the Old Latin, the word confronted students of the Bible in S. Matthew, and in this position it was commented upon and discussed. But here its influence ended. S. Augustine on the morrow of Jerome's Revision still continues to quote and to explain the petition with the word *quotidianum*, as S. Hilary[1] had quoted and explained it on the eve. Despite the great name of Jerome, whose authority reigned paramount in Western Christendom for many centuries in all matters of Scriptural interpretation, *quotidianum* was

sicut Lucas ait, etc.' On the other hand in the *Expositio Orationis Dominicæ* (I. p. 599 sq.) he comments on *quotidianum* and does not even mention *supersubstantialem*.

[1] Fragm. *Op.* II. p. 714.

Digitized by Google

never displaced in the Lord's Prayer as used in the offices of the Church. Roman, Gallican, Ambrosian, and Mozarabic Liturgies, all retained it. The word *supersubstantialem* is not, so far as I can learn, once substituted for *quotidianum* in any public services of the Latin Church[1]. The use which Abelard introduced at the Paraclete was obviously isolated and exceptional and appears to have been promptly suppressed. The devotional instinct of the Church would seem to have been repelled by a scholastic term so little in harmony with our Lord's mode of speaking and so ill adapted to religious worship. Even in the *Catechismus ad Parochos*, issued by the Council of Trent as a manual for the guidance of the Roman Clergy and containing a very full exposition of the Lord's Prayer, the word *quotidianum* is retained, while the alternative *supersubstantialem* is not once mentioned, though an eucharistic application is given to the petition, and the epithet *quotidianum* explained in accordance therewith[2].

The pre-reformation versions of the Lord's Prayer

[1] It has been pointed out to me that the words 'panem nostrum quotidianum supersubstantialem' occur in the Breviary in the Orationum Actio post Missam, the two epithets being combined; but this is only an indirect reference to the Lord's Prayer.

[2] It is worthy of notice, as showing how little favour this rendering found, that a Roman Catholic commentator of the 16th century, Maldonatus (on Matth. vi. 11), supposes that Jerome never intended to place *supersubstantialem* in the text, and that it got there by carelessness: 'Hieronymus supersubstantialem vertit, quamquam in eo veterem versionem noluit corrigere. Itaque incaute quidam nostro tempore in vulgata editione pro quotidiano supersubstantialem posuerunt.' This view is quite groundless.

Digitized by Google

in the languages of Western Europe, being derived from the Latin, naturally follow the rendering which the translator in each case had before him. If taken from the Old Latin or from the Service-books, they give *daily*; if from the Vulgate, *supersubstantial*. Among a large number of versions and paraphrases of the Lord's Prayer in the various Teutonic dialects[1] the latter rendering occurs very rarely, and then (for the most part) only *in situ* in the Gospel of S. Matthew, as e.g. 'ofer-wistlic' in the Lindisfarne Gospels and 'over other substaunce' in Wycliffe.

The early reformers also for the most part adopted the familiar rendering. In Luther's Version it is interpreted 'unser täglich brodt', and Calvin also advocates the derivation from ἐπιέναι. So too it is taken in the Latin of Leo Juda. Our own Tyndale rendered it in the same way, and in all the subsequent English Versions of the reformed Church this rendering is retained. On the other hand, the derivation from οὐσία was adopted by Beza[2], whose interpretation however in this particular instance does not appear to have influenced the reformed Versions[3].

[1] See the collection in Marsh's *Origin and History of the English Language*, p. 76 sq.: and also *The Gospel of S. Matthew in Anglo-Saxon and Northumbrian Versions* (Cambr. 1858).

[2] Indeed he himself, though he explains the word 'qui nostris viribus sustentandis sufficiat,' yet retains *quotidianum* in the text, saying 'Mihi religio fuit quicquam immutare in hac precationis formula in ecclesia Dei tanto jam tempore usurpata.'

[3] In Tomson's Version of the N. T. however, which is attached to the Geneva Bible, though it is rendered 'dayly,' a marginal note is

Digitized by Google

To sum up the results of this investigation into the testimony of the most ancient Versions. The Syrian, the Egyptian, the Latin Churches, are distinct from one another. Yet all alike bear witness in the earliest forms of the Lord's Prayer to the one derivation of ἐπιούσιον as against the other. In the Syrian Churches we have testimony from two distinct sources. The Egyptian Churches likewise tell the same tale with a twofold utterance. All may be regarded as prior to Origen, the first Greek father who discusses the meaning of the word. In the Syrian and the Latin Churches we have seen how at a later date the scholastic interpretation was superposed upon the traditional, but with different success. In the former it ultimately prevailed; in the latter it never obtained more than a precarious footing. The Egyptian Churches, being more effectually isolated from Greek influences, preserved the traditional sense to the end.

These Versions alone have any *traditional* value. But others, which were made in the fourth century and later, are not without their importance, as showing how widely the older interpretation still prevailed in the Greek Church, notwithstanding the tendency in the Greek fathers towards the derivation adopted or invented by Origen. It is a remarkable fact that all the remaining Versions which can with probability be assigned to the fourth or fifth centuries give the

added 'That that is meete for our nature for our dayly foode, or such as may suffice our nature and complexion.'

Digitized by Google

temporal sense to ἐπιούσιον, or (in other words) derive it from ἐπιέναι. In the GOTHIC, whose date is about the middle of the fourth century, it is rendered by *sinteinan*, 'continual'; in the ARMENIAN, which was made some time before the middle of the fifth, being begun from the Syriac and afterwards revised and completed from the Greek, it is likewise translated 'continual, daily'; and similarly in the ÆTHIOPIC, whose date is somewhat uncertain, it is given 'of each day' in both S. Matthew and S. Luke.

Thus, tradition is not only not adverse to the derivation which etymological considerations seem to require, but favours it very decidedly. With this strong confirmation, we need not hesitate to adopt it. On the other hand, it is only fair to notice that, though tradition is in accordance with itself and with etymology so far as regards the derivation from ἐπιέναι, yet the same degree of coincidence cannot be claimed on behalf of the derivation from the feminine ἐπιοῦσα and the more precise meaning *for the coming day* thus obtained. Yet this meaning seems to be supported by the *oldest* tradition, and to offer a better justification of the coinage of a new word. At the same time, when the word was once in use, it would require a conscious effort of the mind to separate two etymologies so intimately connected, and the close alliance of meaning, *for the coming day* and *for the coming time*, would encourage a certain vagueness of conception within these narrow limits. It was only when the meaning was stereotyped by translation

Digitized by Google

into another language, that it would assume definitely the one or the other of these two allied senses.

Thus the familiar rendering 'daily,' which has prevailed uninterruptedly in the Western Church from the beginning, is a fairly adequate representation of the original; nor indeed does the English language furnish any one word which would answer the purpose so well.

II.

The word ἐπιούσιος was connected, as we have seen, by several of the fathers with περιούσιος. I hope that sufficient reasons have been given already for rejecting this connexion as based on a false analogy. But still the word περιούσιος is important in itself, and (as its meaning has been somewhat misunderstood by modern as well as by ancient commentators) I take this opportunity of explaining what seems to be its proper force.

Origen (*de Orat.* 27, 1. p. 246), in the passage of which I have already quoted the context (p. 195 sq.), distinguishes these two words ἐπιούσιος, περιούσιος, as follows: ἡ μὲν τὸν εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν συμβαλλόμενον ἄρτον δηλοῦσα, ἡ δὲ τὸν περὶ τὴν οὐσίαν καταγινόμενον λαὸν καὶ κοινωνοῦντα αὐτῷ. With this brief account of the word he contents himself. Apparently he understands περιούσιος to mean 'connected with and participating

Digitized by Google

in absolute being,' thus assigning to it a sense closely allied to that which he has given to ἐπιούσιος. This meaning may be dismissed at once. It does not correspond with the original Hebrew, and it is an impossible sense to attach to the word itself. Nevertheless it is taken up by Victorinus, who writes (*c. Arium* i. 31, *Bibl. Vet. Patr.* VIII. p. 163 ed. Galland.) 'Sic rursus et Paullus in Epistola ad Titum *populum περιούσιον*, circa substantiam, hoc est circa vitam consistentem populum'; and again (ii. 8. ib. p. 177), 'Latinus cum non intelligeret *περιούσιον ὄχλον, περιούσιον, τὸν περιόντα* [read *περὶ ὄντα*?] id est, circa vitam quam Christus et habet et dat, posuit *populum abundantem.*' And Cyril of Alexandria on S. Luke (Mai, II. p. 266), in the context of a passage already quoted (p. 212), likewise connects it with ἐπιούσιος, giving it an equally impossible sense, *ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπιουσίου τὸν περιούσιον εἰπών, τουτέστι τὸν ἀρκοῦντα καὶ τοῦ τελείως ἔχειν οὐχ ἡττώμενον.*

On the other hand, Jerome (on Tit. ii. 14, VII. p. 725 sq.) says that, having thought much over the word *περιούσιον* and consulted 'the wise of this world' whether they had met with it elsewhere, without getting any satisfaction, he betook him to the passages in the Old Testament where it occurs, and by a comparison of these arrived at the meaning *egregium, præcipuum, peculiarem*, a sense which (as we have seen) he gives to *ἐπιούσιον* also. Though wholly wrong as applied to *ἐπιούσιον*, this meaning is fairly adequate to represent *περιούσιον*; but it is clear from

Digitized by Google

the context that Jerome does not seize the exact force of the word, which appears also to have escaped later commentators.

We may reasonably infer from the notices of Origen and Jerome that this word was unknown out of Biblical Greek: and we have therefore no choice but to follow the method of the latter, and investigate the passages of the Old Testament where it occurs.

The expression λαὸς περιούσιος is found four times in the LXX; Exod. xix. 5, Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, xxvi. 18. In the first passage it is a rendering of the single word סְגֻלָּה, in the three last of עַם סְגֻלָּה. Moreover in Ps. cxxxiv (cxxxv). 4 לִסְגֻלָּתוֹ is translated εἰς περιουσιασμὸν ἑαυτῷ. In all these passages the reference is to the Israelites as the peculiar people of God. Once more, in Eccles. ii. 8 we have συνήγαγόν μοι καίγε ἀργύριον καίγε χρυσίον καὶ περιουσιασμοὺς βασιλέων καὶ τῶν χωρῶν, where again περιουσιασμοὺς represents סְגֻלָּה, but in this instance without any reference to the chosen people. These appear to be the only passages in the LXX where περιούσιος, περιουσιασμός, occur. But סְגֻלָּה is found besides in two other places: in Mal. iii. 17, where again it refers to the chosen people and where it is rendered εἰς περιποίησιν; and in 1 Chron. xxix. 3, where Solomon says 'I have a סְגֻלָּה [translated in our Version 'of mine own proper good'] gold and silver which I have given to the house of my God, over and above all that I have prepared for the holy

Digitized by Google

house,' rendered by the LXX ἔστι μοι ὃ περιπεποίημαι χρυσίον καὶ ἀργύριον κ.τ.λ.

Of these two renderings which the LXX offers for סְגֻלָּה, the one is adopted by S. Paul, Tit. ii. 14 λαὸς περιούσιος; the other by S. Peter, 1 Pet. ii. 9 λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν. The reference in S. Peter is to Exod. xix. 5, where however the rendering περιούσιος is found in the LXX.

The Hebrew root סגל, from which סגלה comes, is not found in the Bible. But the senses of kindred roots in Hebrew, such as סגר, and of other derivatives of this same root in the allied languages, point to its meaning. It signifies 'to surround on all sides,' and so to 'gather together, set apart, reserve, appropriate.'

In grammar the Rabbinical expression for a *proper name* is שם סגולה. In logic the predicable *proprium* is designated סגולה by them.

Applied to property, the word סגלה would denote the private treasure which a person acquires for himself or possesses by himself alone, as distinguished from that which he shares with others. Of a king, we might say that it was the 'fiscus' as distinguished from the 'ærarium', the privy purse as opposed to the public treasury. It is something reserved for his private uses. In two of the passages where it occurs, Eccles. ii. 8, 1 Chron. xxix. 3, it refers to kings; and in the latter it seems to be carefully distinguished from the money which would naturally be devoted to expenditure on public works.

Digitized by Google

Thus there is no great difficulty about the original Hebrew word. On the other hand it is less easy to see how the same idea can be represented by the Greek περιούσιος. Jerome speaks as though the leading notion of the word were 'superiority,' derived from περιεῖναι in the sense 'to excel.' Obviously this meaning would not correspond to the original.

We arrive at a more just conception of its force by considering a synonyme which Jerome himself points out. This same Hebrew word, which in the LXX is given περιούσιον, was rendered by Symmachus ἐξαίρετον (Hieron. *Op.* VI. pp. 34, 726). Jerome indeed is satisfied with translating ἐξαίρετον by *præcipuum* or *egregium*; but its meaning is much more precise and forcible. It was used especially of the portion which was set apart as the share of the king or general, before the rest of the spoils were distributed by lot or otherwise to the soldiers of the victorious army. The exemption from the common mode of apportionment in favour of rank or virtue is the leading idea of the word. Thus in Plutarch, *Vit. Cor.* 10, we are told that when Coriolanus, as a reward for his bravery, was asked to select from the spoils ten of every kind before the distribution to the rest (ἐξέλεσθαι δέκα πάντα πρὸ τοῦ νέμειν τοῖς ἄλλοις), he declined to do so, saying that he would take his chance with the others, but he added, ἐξαίρετον μίαν αἰτοῦμαι χάριν, 'I have one favour to ask, as an *exceptional boon*.' In the triumphant anticipation of Sisera's mother, 'Have they not divided the prey? to every man [lit. to the

Digitized by Google

head of a man] a damsel or two, to Sisera a prey of divers colours, etc.', we have the idea which a Greek poet might express by ἐξαίρετον δώρημα (e.g. Æsch. *Eum.* 380, comp. *Agam.* 927), the special treasure assigned to the captain over and above the distribution which was made to the rest counted by heads. This sense of ἐξαίρετον is too common to need further illustration; and I cannot doubt that Symmachus selected it on this account as an appropriate word to express the idea of the original. The leading idea is not *superiority*, as Jerome seems to imagine, but *exception*. 'Egregium,' strictly interpreted, might represent it, but not 'præcipuum.' It is the 'exsortem ducere honorem' of Virgil. This idea fitly expresses the relations of Jehovah to Israel, whom in the language of the Old Testament elsewhere He retained under His special care (see the notes on Clem. Rom. 29).

The same conception seems to be involved in περιούσιος. This word may have been invented by the LXX translators, or it may have had some local currency in their age: but, if the latter was the case, the fact was unknown to Origen and Jerome, for they speak of περιούσιος as not occurring out of the Bible. In either case, it might be derived from περιών, on the analogy of ἑκούσιος, ἐθελούσιος, etc., or from οὐσία, like ἐνούσιος, ἀνούσιος, etc. (see above, p. 200, 201). Thus its meaning would be either 'existing over and above,' or 'possessed over and above'; and the same idea of exception from the common laws of distribution would be involved as in ἐξαίρετος,

Digitized by Google

S. Jerome mentions also[1] that in another passage Symmachus had adopted the Latin word *peculiarem*, as a rendering of סגלה. He doubtless ventured on this bold expedient because the Greek language did not furnish so exact an equivalent as *peculium:* for ἐξαίρετον, adequate as it is in some respects, introduces the new idea of division of *spoils*, which is wanting in the original. On the other hand the Latin *peculium*, being used to denote the private purse which a member of the family, whether slave or free, was allowed in particular cases to possess and accumulate for his own use, distinct from the property which the paterfamilias administered for the good of the whole, approached very closely to the meaning of the Hebrew: and moreover there was a convenient adjective *peculiaris* derived therefrom. Impressed, it would appear, with the value of the word which he had thus learnt from Symmachus, Jerome himself has almost universally adopted *peculium, peculiaris*, as a rendering of סגלה in the Old Testament; e.g. Exod. xix. 5 'Eritis mihi *in peculium* de cunctis populis,' 1 Chron.

[1] Hieron. *Op.* VI. p. 34 'licet in quodam loco *peculiare* interpretatus sit'; *ib.* VI. p. 726 'in alio volumine Latino sermone utens *peculiarem* interpretatus est.' Different interpretations of this second passage have been given; but, compared with the first, it can only mean that 'in another book of Scripture Symmachus adopted a Latin expression, translating the word by *peculiarem*'; just in the same way as Ignatius writing in Greek uses δεσέρτωρ, δεπόσιτα, ἄκκεπτα (*Polyc.* 6), because the Greek language did not supply such convenient terms to express his meaning. It is extremely improbable that Symmachus wrote any work in Latin as some have supposed.

Digitized by Google

xxix. 3 'Quæ obtuli in domum Dei mei *de peculio*,' Deut. xxvi. 18 (comp. vii. 6, xiv. 2) 'Elegit te hodie ut sis ei populus *peculiaris*,' etc.[1]

Our English translators in adopting this word 'peculiar' after the Vulgate were obviously aware of its appropriate technical sense. This appears from the mode in which they use it; e.g. Ps. cxxxv. 4 'The Lord hath chosen Jacob unto himself and Israel for his *peculiar treasure*' (comp. Exod. xix. 5, Eccles. ii. 8, in both which passages the word 'treasure' is added). Twice only have they departed from the word 'peculiar' in rendering סגלה; in Deut. vii. 6, where it is translated 'a *special* people,' and in Mal. iii. 17, where it is represented by 'jewels' but with a marginal alternative, 'special treasure.' In this last passage the rendering should probably be, 'And they shall be to me, saith the Lord of Hosts, in the day which I appoint, for a peculiar treasure,' and not as our Version has it, 'And they shall be mine, saith the Lord of Hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels.' In Tit. ii. 14 λαὸς περιούσιος, and 1 Pet. ii. 9 λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, where (as I have already observed) we have two distinct Greek renderings of the same Hebrew, the expressions are once more united in our Version, which, following Tyndale, translates both by

[1] The normal rendering in the Old Latin (which was translated from the LXX) was *abundans*: see e.g. Exod. xix. 5, Tit. ii. 14, and the quotation of Victorinus given above (p. 221). This would be a very natural interpretation of περιούσιος to any one unacquainted with the Hebrew.

Digitized by Google

'a peculiar people.' Strangely enough S. Jerome, who introduces *peculium*, *peculiaris*, in the Old Testament, has other and diverse renderings in both these passages of the New; *populus acceptabilis* in the one case, and *populus adquisitionis* in the other. His New Testament was executed before his Old: and it would appear that in the interval he had recognised the value of the rendering suggested by Symmachus, and adopted it accordingly.

Digitized by Google

INDEX I.[1]

	PAGE
MATT. i. 1 ...	100
2, 3 ...	160
6 ...	102
22 ...	90, 91, 121
ii. 4 ...	101
5 ...	122
6 ...	160
15 ...	87, 121
17 ...	121, 157
iii. 1 ...	95
3 ...	121
4 ...	116
13 ...	95
14 ...	96
15, 16 ...	131
iv. 5 ...	109
6 ...	125
8 ...	111
13 ...	175
v. 1 ...	110
15 ...	42, 110, 118, 168
16 ...	42
32 ...	70
vi. 11 ...	195—234
13 ...	30
16, 18 ...	130
25 ...	171, 204
31 ...	171

	PAGE
MATT. vi. 34 ...	171, 203, 204
viii. 12 ...	105
ix. 16 ...	143
x. 4 ...	138, 139
9 ...	88
16 ...	137
29 ...	165, 166
xi. 2 ...	101
xii. 1, 5, 10, 11, 12	146
18 ...	141
xiii. 20 ...	48, 176
21 ...	176
24, 25 ...	68
33 ...	169
42, 50 ...	105
55 ...	160
xiv. 8 ...	136
xv. 3, 6 ...	124
21 ...	175
22 ...	138
27 ...	134
35 ...	73
xvi. 9, 10 ...	72
14 ...	157
16 ...	101
17 ...	159, 160
25 ...	58
26 ...	47, 58
xvii. 1 ...	111

[1] I owe this index of passages to the kindness of Mr A. A. VanSittart.

Digitized by Google

	PAGE
MATT. xvii. 10 ...	152
21 ...	29
24 *sq.* ...	168
25 ...	178
xviii. 6, 7 ...	177
24 *sq.* ...	168
33 ...	34
xix. 8 ...	90
9 ...	71
17 ...	31
19 ...	159
xx. 2, 9, 10, 13	166
20 ...	34
xxi. 4 ...	90, 91, 121
12 ...	79, 109
33 *sq.* ...	69
xxii. 1 *sq.* ...	71
9, 10 ...	68
13 ...	105
xxiii. 6 ...	43
7, 8 ...	162
24 ...	183, 185
35 ...	79
xxiv. 5 ...	101
12 ...	98
15 ...	121
21 ...	90
27 ...	130
30 ...	125
51 ...	105
xxv. 6 ...	90
14 *sq.* ...	168
30 ...	105
32 ...	34
46 ...	40
xxvi. 15 ...	140
25 ...	162
36 ...	144
48 ...	69
49 ...	69, 162

	PAGE
MATT. xxvi. 50 ...	128
56 ...	90, 91
63 ...	101
64 ...	125
69, 71 ...	113
xxvii. 9 ...	30
15 ...	115
27 ...	49
33 ...	161
35 ...	121
xxviii. 19 ...	25, 126
MARK i. 1 ...	30, 100
21 ...	146
ii. 15, 16 ...	113
21 ...	143
23 ...	146
iii. 2, 4 ...	146
5 ...	136
18 ...	138
iv. 16 ...	48
21 ...	110, 168
29 ...	140
v. 13 ...	110
vi. 3 ...	160
27 ...	165
37 ...	167
52 ...	136
vii. 9 ...	124
26 ...	157
31 ...	175
viii. 19, 20 ...	72
29 ...	101
36 ...	47
ix. 2 ...	111
5 ...	162
29 ...	29
41 ...	100, 101
x. 51 ...	162
xi. 4 ...	110
15 ...	109

Digitized by Google

	PAGE
MARK xi. 21 ...	162
xii. 26 ...	125
39 ...	43
42 ...	165
xiii. 14 ...	121
28 ...	134
xiv. 5 ...	167
32 ...	144
45 ...	162
53, 54 ...	131
66, 69 ...	113
xv. 6 ...	115
16 ...	49
22 ...	161
xvi. 9—20 ...	28
LUKE i. 1 ...	142
39 ...	112, 160, 167
59 ...	96
63 ...	173
65 ...	112, 167
ii. 11 ...	100
18 ...	119
24 ...	110
33 ...	29
36 ...	154
iii. 23 ...	127
24 ...	159
26 ...	160
27 ...	159
30 ...	159, 160
33 ...	160
iv. 5 ...	111
9 ...	109
11 ...	125
20 ...	173
vi. 15 ...	138
16 ...	115
17 ...	111
36 ...	76
vii. 4 ...	176, 177
LUKE vii. 5 ...	110
33, 34 ...	95
41 ...	167
45, 46 ...	69
viii. 14 ...	48
ix. 25 ...	47
55 ...	28
x. 35 ...	166
xi. 3 ...	195—234
33 ...	110, 168
51 ...	79
xii. 6 ...	166
35 ...	118
xiii. 6 ...	134
21 ...	169
23 ...	95
28 ...	105
xv. 8 ...	167, 168
9 ...	167
xvi. 6, 7 ...	169
xvii. 1, 2 ...	177
xviii. 12 ...	88
31 ...	122
xix. 13 ...	42, 168, 177
15 ...	42
xx. 37 ...	125
xxi. 19 ...	87
xxii. 1 ...	162
43, 44 ...	28
xxiii. 2 ...	100
5 ...	161
17 ...	115
33 ...	161
34 ...	28
35, 39 ...	101
xxiv. 10 ...	98
JOHN i. 3 ...	82, 122, 123
7 ...	119, 123
8 ...	117
9 ...	118

Digitized by Google

	PAGE
JOHN i. 10 ...	122, 123
11 ...	69
14 ...	57
16 ...	103
17 ...	100, 123
18 ...	20, 27
21 ...	102
25 ...	101, 102
29 ...	141
39 ...	162
43 ...	159
50 ...	162
ii. 6 ...	168
iii. 2 ...	162
8 ...	57
10 ...	108
19 ...	118
26 ...	162
iv. 5 ...	144
6 ...	73
27 ...	114
31 ...	162
37 ...	116
v. 1 ...	116
3, 4 ...	30
35 ...	117
44 ...	116
vi. 4 ...	116
7 ...	167
14 ...	102
22 *sq.* ...	112
25 ...	162
51 ...	224
69 ...	101
vii. 1 ...	161
19, 20 ...	179
25 ...	179
26 ...	101
40 ...	102
viii. 1—11 ...	27, 28
JOHN viii. 58 ...	75
ix. 2 ...	162
5 ...	118
22 ...	100
x. 16 ...	71
xi. 8 ...	162
14 ...	182
xii. 5 ...	167
6 ...	142
13 ...	108
40 ...	136
xiii. 12 ...	73
23, 25 ...	72
27 ...	128
xiv. 5, 6 ...	103
16 *sq.* ...	50, 53, 55
18 ...	53
26 ...	50, 53
xv. 3 ...	124
26 ...	50, 53, 55
xvi. 1, 4, 6 ...	34
7 ...	50, 53
30 ...	39
xvii. 3 ...	100
xviii. 1 ...	144
28, 33 ...	49
39 ...	116
xix. 9 ...	49
17 ...	161
36 ...	91
xx. 16 ...	162
22 ...	58
25 ...	34
xxi. 15, 16, 17	159
20 ...	73
ACTS i. 3 ...	144
13 ...	138
18 ...	88
ii. 3 ...	141
11 ...	157

Digitized by Google

	PAGE
ACTS ii. 23 ...	120
27, 31 ...	79
38 ...	100
43 ...	120
47 ...	94
iii. 6 ...	100
13, 26 ...	141
iv. 25, 27 ...	80
27, 30 ...	141
vii. 26 ...	97
45 ...	158
viii. 5 ...	115
16 ...	126
30 ...	59
37 ...	30
ix. 2 ...	103
35 ...	108, 154
x. 2 ...	80
30 ...	29
xi. 17 ...	87, 116
19 ...	162
xii. 4 ...	164
9 ...	120
12 ...	157
22 ...	80
25 ...	157
xiii. 14 ...	146
21 ...	154
50 ...	145
xiv. 13 ...	144
xv. 3 ...	162
xvi. 11 ...	199
35, 38 ...	165
xvii. 1 ...	110
2 ...	146
5 ...	80
19, 22 ...	161
23 ...	79, 177
29 ...	144
xviii. 12 ...	163

	PAGE
ACTS xviii. 14 ...	175
xix. 1 ...	174
2 ...	86
3, 5 ...	126
9 ...	104
15 ...	60
23 ...	104
30 ...	80
31 ...	164
33 ...	80
35 ...	164
38 ...	163
xx. 2 ...	157
15 ...	199
xxi. 2 ...	162
3 ...	130
15 ...	174
18 ...	199
28 ...	80
31 ...	179
31, 32 ...	164
xxii. 24—26 ...	164
xxiii. 17—23 ...	164
35 ...	49
xxiv. 5, 6 ...	179
22 ...	104
xxv. 22 ...	96
26 ...	64
xxvi. 24, 25 ...	34
xxvii. 12 ...	162
20 ...	130
xxviii. 13 ...	173
15 ...	161, 186
16 ...	164
16, 29 ...	29
ROM. i. 29 ...	175, 176
ii. 1 ...	62
8 ...	137
12 *sq.* ...	99
18 ...	106

Digitized by Google

	PAGE
ROM. ii. 22 ...	144
24 ...	124
26 ...	136
iii. 4, 6 ...	182
19 *sq.* ...	99
25 ...	135
24—26 ...	50
iv. 3, 9 ...	46
13 *sq.* ...	99
19 ...	31
22 ...	46
v. 9 ...	106
15 ...	86
15—19 ...	97
vi. 1 *sq.* ...	84
2 ...	84, 86
3 ...	84, 126
4, 6 ...	84
8 ...	84, 86
12, 13 ...	142
17, 18 ...	84
21 ...	182
22 ...	84
23 ...	142
vii. 1 *sq.* ...	99
4 ...	84
6 ...	84, 86
viii. 6 ...	86
11 ...	124
16 ...	54
24 ...	94
26 ...	54
ix. 3 ...	96
25 ...	80
26 ...	80, 157
x. 9, 13 ...	94
15 ...	34
xi. 2 ...	125
7 ...	136
8 ...	139

	PAGE
ROM. xi. 20 ...	175
25 ...	136
xii. 2 ...	77
3 ...	58
11 ...	2
19 ...	46, 106
xiii. 11 ...	87
xiv. 14 ...	126
22, 23 ...	67
xv. 4, 5 ...	34
32 ...	106
xvi. 1 ...	114
3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	35, 44
7 ...	161
9 ...	156
10—16 ...	35, 44
19 ...	137
23 ...	164
1 COR. i. 10 ...	145
13 ...	126
18 ...	95
28 ...	208
ii. 13—15 ...	62
14, 15 ...	63
iii. 5 ...	87
17 ...	35
iv. 3, 4, 5 ...	62
8 ...	181
v. 9 ...	107
vi. 1—6 ...	62
vii. 5 ...	29
31 ...	59
32 ...	172
viii. 6 ...	122, 125
10, 12 ...	116
ix. 3 ...	63
4 ...	98
22 ...	83
x. 2 ...	126
16 *sq.* ...	35

Digitized by Google

	PAGE
1 Cor. x. 25, 27 ...	63
32 ...	157
xi. 28—34 ...	64, 65
29, 31, 32...	62
xii. 2 ...	59
4 *sq.* ...	44
4 *sq.* ...	35
13 ...	126, 157
28 ...	129
xiii. 8 ...	36
9, 12 ...	61
xiv. 7 ...	74
16 ...	174
20 ...	73
23 ...	183
24, 29 ...	64
36 ...	70
xv. 2 ...	87, 94
4—20 ...	88, 89
22 ...	86
24—28 ...	36
40 ...	74, 75
51 ...	30
xvi. 1, 2 ...	37
12 ...	106
15 ...	181
22 ...	129
2 Cor. i. 1 ...	157
3—8 ...	37
9 ...	67
13 ...	59
19 ...	157
20 ...	32
23 ...	134
ii. 6 ...	99
14 ...	135
15 ...	95
iii. 1 ...	37
2 ...	59
5, 6 ...	37

	PAGE
2 Cor. iii. 7 ...	38
11 ...	69
13 *sq.* ...	38
14 ...	38, 136
18 ...	38
iv. 2 ...	175
3 ...	38
4 ...	141
8 ...	59
13 ...	87
15 ...	124
v. 6—11 ...	38
14 ...	86
16 ...	61
vi. 9 ...	62
10 ...	59
vii. 7 ...	38
10 ...	76
11 ...	107
13, 14 ...	83
viii. 10—12 ...	38
19 ...	116
ix. 2—5 ...	38
13 ...	181
x. 5 ...	143
12 ...	59, 62
13, 15, 16	38
xi. 3 ...	125
4 ...	75
9 ...	143
16—18 ...	39
xii. 1 ...	32
2 *sq.* ...	89
2, 3 ...	39
7 ...	143
9 ...	57
13 ...	99
13, 14 ...	143
15 ...	68
17 ...	82

Digitized by Google

	PAGE
2 COR. xii. 18 ...	82, 107
20 ...	137, 175
xiii. 9, 11 ...	145
14 ...	25
GAL. i. 6 ...	75
ii. 16 ...	87
16—21 ...	85
iii. 3 ...	85
6 ...	46
10 *sq.* ...	99
19 ...	120
27 ...	85, 126
iv. 20 ...	96
v. 13 ...	85
20 ...	137
24 ...	85
EPH. i. 1 ...	21, 208
11, 13 ...	85
23 ...	41, 103
ii. 5, 8 ...	94
5, 6, 13, 14	85
iii. 10 ...	120
19 ...	103
iv. 1, 4, 7 ...	85
13 ...	103
18 ...	136
29 ...	128
30 ...	85
v. 15 ...	59
vi. 12 ...	179
PHIL. i. 13 ...	49
14 ...	98
17 ...	137
ii. 3 ...	137
6 *sq.* ...	78
9 ...	107
13 ...	39
15 ...	130, 137
30 ...	31
iii. 2, 3 ...	58

	PAGE
PHIL. iii. 3 *sq.* ...	39
14 ...	179
iv. 2 ...	161
2, 3 ...	127, 128
6 ...	172, 204
19 ...	211, 212
COL. i. 13 ...	85
16 ...	82, 122
19 ...	102
ii. 5 ...	142
8 ...	136
9 ...	103
9, 10 ...	41
11 *sq.* ...	84
16 ...	146
20 ...	86
iii. 1, 3 ...	84
3 ...	86
8 ...	179
13 ...	175
15 ...	85
iv. 10 ...	134, 157
14 ...	157
1 THESS. ii. 4 ...	39
16 ...	106
iv. 4 ...	87
6 ...	107
2 THESS. i. 6 ...	39
ii. 1, 2 ...	127
3 *sq.* ...	104
6 ...	41
7 ...	41, 178
iii. 11 ...	59
1 TIM. i. 4 ...	184
iii. 1 ...	3
3 ...	145
11 ...	114
13 ...	178
16 ...	27, 179
v. 4 ...	174

Digitized by Google

	PAGE
1 TIM. v. 19 ...	3
vi. 2 ...	116
5 ...	117
17 ...	175
2 TIM. i. 7, 9 ...	85
ii. 19 ...	117
iii. 4 ...	175
iv. 11 ...	157
TIT. i. 7 ...	145
12 ...	157
ii. 14 ...	235, 237, 241
iii. 5 ...	85
PHILEM. 2 ...	186
24 ...	157
HEB. i. 1 ...	43
2 ...	122
ii. 10 ...	122
16 ...	140
iii. 11 ...	47
iv. 3 ...	47
8 ...	158
v. 2 ...	180
12 ...	180
vi. 1 ...	128
7 ...	124
8, 16 ...	117
vii. 14 ...	89, 160
21—24 ...	89
viii. 8 ...	160
13 ...	39
ix. 1 ...	117
6—9, 18...	93
28 ...	142
x. 1 ...	93, 117
30 ...	46
xi. 10 ...	104
31 ...	155
xii. 26 ...	134
JAMES i. 15 ...	77
17 ...	76

	PAGE
JAMES ii. 2, 3 ...	39
23 ...	46
25 ...	155
iii. 5 ...	140
14, 16 ...	137
v. 9 ...	175
16 ...	182
20 ...	46
1 PET. i. 3 ...	85
16 ...	76
18 ...	85
ii. 4 ...	127
9 ...	237, 241
10 ...	80
16 ...	176
21 ...	85
24 ...	142
iii. 9 ...	85
21 ...	136
iv. 8 ...	46
v. 7 ...	172, 204
13 ...	157
2 PET. ii. 1, 3 ...	40
13 ...	138
iii. 12 ...	128
1 JOHN ii. 1 ...	50
iv. 9, 10, 14...	83
v. 6 ...	114
7 ...	24—27
9, 10 ...	40
JUDE 12 ...	134, 137, 138
REV. i. 4 ...	133
15 ...	40
ii. 13 ...	41
26 ...	132
iii. 12 ...	132
17 ...	40, 108
21 ...	132
iv. 4 ...	41
5 ...	118

Digitized by Google

	PAGE
REV. iv. 11 ...	180
v. 5 ...	160
vi. 6 ...	167, 169
vii. 5 ...	160
6 ...	154
12, 14 ...	105
15 ...	56
viii. 10 ...	118
12 ...	130
xi. 9, 11 ...	114
16 ...	41
REV. xiii. 6 ...	56
xiv. 15, 16 ...	125
xvi. 10 ...	41
xvii. 1 ...	105
6, 7 ...	40
xviii. 2 ...	40
23 ...	130
xix. 9 ...	117
xxi. 3 ...	56
14, 19 *sq.*	105
24 ...	95

Digitized by Google

INDEX II.

Abelard on ἐπιούσιος, 226 sq., 230
Acts of the Apostles, text of, 29
Aethiopic rendering of ἐπιούσιος, 233
Alford (Dean) on Revision, 47, 50, 58
ambiguities of expression, 179 sq.
Ambrose (S.) on ἐπιούσιος, 221 sq.
Andrewes (Bp.), 11
Anselm, 226
Antigenidas, 8
Antiochene School, 209
aorist, confused with perfect, 80 sq.; its significance in S. Paul, 84; various misrenderings of, 86 sq.
Apphia, Appia, 186
archaisms in the English Version, 170 sq.
  by, 119
  by and by, 176
  carefulness, 172
  carriages, 174
  chamberlain, 164
  coasts, 174 sq.
  comforter, 52
  debate, 175
  deputy, 163
  devotions, 177
  dishonesty, 175
  fetch a compass, 173
  generation, 177
  go about to, 178
  grudge, 175
  high-minded, 175
  instantly, 176
  let, 178
  lewdness, 175
  maliciousness, 176
  minister, 173
  nephew, 174
  occupy, 42, 177
  of, 119
  offend, offence, 177
  prevent, 178
  room, 43, 174
  scrip, 174
  thought, 171 sq.
  writing-table, 173
Armenian rendering of ἐπιούσιος, 233
Arnold (Mr M.) quoted, 189 sq.
article (the definite), neglect of, 97 sq.; insertion of, 113 sq.; general ignorance of, 116 sq.
Asiarchs, 164
aspirate (Hebrew) omitted in Greek, 155
Athanasius (S.) on ἐπιούσιος, 208
Augustine (S.), on Jerome's revision, 3 sq., 5, 8, 14; on the heavenly witnesses, 26; on ἐπιούσιος, 229

Digitized by Google

Authorised Version: historical parallel to, 9 sq.; translators' forebodings of, 10; never authorised, 11; gradual reception of, 11; itself a revision, 14; faulty text of, 19 sq.; distinctions created in, 33 sq.; distinctions obliterated in, 60 sq.; errors of grammar in, 80 sq.; errors of lexicography in, 133 sq.; its caprice in proper names, titles, etc., 147 sq.; archaisms in, 170 sq.; ambiguities of expression in, 179 sq.; faulty English in, 181 sq.; editorial errors and misprints in, 182 sq.; corrections in later editions of, 129, 184 sq.; variable orthography of, 185 sq.; pure English of, 190 sq.
-αῖος, adjectives in, 200
αἴρειν, 141
ἀκέραιος, 137
ἄλλος, ἕτερος, 74 sq.
ἀνακρίνειν, ἀνάκρισις, 62 sq.
ἀναπίπτειν, 72 sq.
ἀνενεγκεῖν, 142
ἀσσάριον, 165 sq.
αὐγάζειν, 141
αὐλή, πολμνη, 71

Barjona, 159 sq.
Basil (S.) on *ἐπιούσιος*, 204, 210
Bentley quoted, 97 sq.
Bernard's (S.) controversy with Abelard, 226, 229
besaunt, 168
Beza, 231
Bible; see *Authorised Version*
Bishops'; 11, 27, 70, 71, 88, 128, 135, 139, 149, 151, 162, 163, 165, 181, 182, 183, 184
Coverdale's; 26, 71, 128, 135, 139, 149, 165
Geneva; 11, 71, 88, 128, 135, 139, 140, 149, 151, 162, 163, 165, 181; Testament (1557), 26, 128, 135, 139, 140, 143, 163, 165; Tomson's Testament, 183, 231
Great; 26, 71, 128, 135, 139, 150, 162, 165
Rheims; 44, 71, 78, 135, 139, 164, 169, 180, 181
Tyndale's; 26, 44, 70, 71, 78, 80, 81, 121, 128, 135, 139, 144, 165, 169, 177, 178, 180, 231, 241
Wycliffe's (and Wycliffite); 78, 80, 135, 139, 163, 164, 166, 168, 169, 177, 181, 231
Breviary, 230
βαστάζειν, 142
βάτος, 169
βωμός, θυσιαστήριον, 79

Calvin, 231
Cassianus, 225 sq.
Christ and the Christ, 100 sq.
Chrysostom (S.) on *ἐπιούσιος*, 210 sq.
coins, rendering of, 165 sq.
Corinthians, 2nd Epistle to the; recurrence of words in, 37 sq.
Coverdale's Bible; see *Bible*
Cretans, Cretes, Cretians, 157
Cureton, 215
Cyprian (S.), 26, 220
Cyril (S.) of Alexandria; on *ἐπιούσιος*, 212; on *περιούσιος*, 235

Digitized by Google

Cyril (S.) of Jerusalem; on ἐπιούσιος, 210
καλεσθαι, 118
Καναναῖος, Κανανίτης, 138
κατάνυξις, κατανύσσειν, 139
καταρτίζειν, 145
κόλπος, στῆθος, 72
κόρος, 169
κόφινοι, σπυρίδες, 71
κρίνειν and its compounds, 62 sq.
κτᾶσθαι, κεκτῆσθαι, 87 sq.
χοῖνιξ, 167, 169
χωρίον, 144

Damascene (S. John) on ἐπιούσιος, 212
Damasus, Pope, 1, 8
deaconesses, 114 sq.
didrachma, 168
digamma, 202
Dionysius Carthusianus, 226
drachma, 167
δῆμος, λαός, 80
δηνάριον, 166 sq.
διά, distinguished from ὑπό, 119 sq.; its connexion with Inspiration, 121 sq.; with the doctrine of the Word, 122 sq.; misrendered with the accusative, 123 sq., 135 sq.
διάβολος, δαιμόνιον, 78 sq.
διαμερίζεσθαι, 141
δικαίωμα, 136
δόσις, δώρημα, 76 sq.
δοῦλοι, διάκονοι, 71

Easter, 162
Egyptian Service-books, 219
Egyptian Versions; rendering of παράκλητος, 55; of σπιλάδες, 137; of ἐπιούσιος, 218 sq., 232
Elias, Elijah, 152, 154
Ellicott (Bp.) on Revision, 18, 49, 92
English language, present knowledge of the, 189 sq.
Ephesians, Epistle to the; its destination and genuineness, 20
Ephrem Syrus, 218
Evangelists, parallel passages in the; 31, 47 sq., 111, 113 sq., 144, 161
εἶναι, γίνεσθαι, 75 sq.
εἰς wrongly translated, 125 sq.
Ἕλλην, Ἑλληνιστής, 157
ἐν wrongly translated, 126
ἐξαίρετος, 238 sq., 240
ἐπερώτημα, 136
ἐπί wrongly translated, 125; the ι elided in composition, 201
ἐπιγινώσκειν, ἐπίγνωσις, 61 sq.
ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι, 140
ἐπιοῦσα, 199, 203
ἐπιούσιος, 195 sq.
ἐπουσιώδης, 202, 205
ἐριθεία, 137

Five Clergymen, Revision of the; 50, 91 sq.
Fulke's answer to Martin, 150 sq.

Gehenna, Hades, 79
gender, change of, disregarded, 69
Geneva Bible, Testament; see *Bible*
Gothic Version of ἐπιούσιος, 233
Greek, Grecian, Greece, Grecia, 157
Greek forms of Hebrew names, 154 sq.
Greek scholarship in England, 188 sq.
Gregory the Great on the Latin Versions, 9
Gregory Nyssen on ἐπιούσιος, 210
Grote (Prof.), 184

Digitized by Google

gutturals (Hebrew), how dealt with in Greek, 155
γινώσκειν, 60, 61
γραμματεύς, 164

Hare (Archdn.), 50
Hebrews, Epistle to the; date of, 93 sq.
Hebrews, Gospel of the; its origin and value, 213 sq.; rendering of ἐπιούσιος, 213
Heloise, 226
hendiadys, 129
Hilary (S.) on ἐπιούσιος, 229
hypallage, 128 sq.

idols of the cave, market-place, 92 sq.
imperfect tense mistranslated, 95 sq.
Isidore of Seville, 11
Ismenias, 8
ἱερόν, ναός, 79
ἱεροσυλεῖν, 144
ἱστάναι, 140

Jacob of Sarug, 217 sq.
James, Jacob, 158
Jeremy, Jeremias, 157
Jerome (S.) revises the Latin Bible, 1; his detractors and opponents, 2 sq., 14; version of Book of Jonah, 4; corrects the text, 4 sq., 15, 23; does not translate but revise, 5; his Jewish teachers, 6; his devotion to the work, 7 sq.; gradual reception of his Version, 8 sq., 16; his rendering of παράκλητος, 54; of ἐπιούσιος, 233 sq.; of περιούσιος, 223, 235 sq., 238 sq.
Jerusalem, spelling of, 155
Jesus, Joshua, 158
Jewry, 161
Johanan, John, etc., 158 sq.
John, the father of S. Peter, 159
John (S.), disciples of, 28
John (S.), Gospel of: its genuineness, 20; minute traits in, 73, 108; coincidences with the Revelation, 45, 56 sq.; with the First Epistle, 45, 50 sq., 55; later than the other Gospels, 91
John (S.), Apocalypse of: broken syntax of, 132 sq.; see *John (S.), Gospel of*
Jona, two distinct names, 159
Jude, Juda, Judah, Judas, 160
Juvencus, 220

Laodiceans, Epistle to the, 21, 22
Latin, Old; false readings in, 2 sq.; retained in Service books, 12; rendering of παράκλητος, 54; of σπιλάδες, 137; of ἐπιούσιος, 219 sq.; of περιούσιος, 241; various reading in the Lord's Prayer, 227
Latin Vulgate: see *Jerome (S.)*
Latinisms, 170 sq., 180, 189 sq.
Lindisfarne Gospels, 231
Lord's Prayer, the early use of, 196; see also Appendix (*passim*)
Lucas, Luke, 157
Luke (S.), Gospel of; two editions of, 28 sq.; its classical language, 112, 167
Luther's Bible, 26, 231
λύχνος, φῶς, 117 sq.

Magdalene, spelling and pronunciation of, 156
Maldonatus, 230
Marcus, Mark, 157

Digitized by Google

Mark (S.), Gospel of; the conclusion, 28
Marsh (Mr) on revision, etc., 91 sq., 188, 191, 193
Martin's (Gregory) attack on English Bibles, 149 sq.
Mary, Miriam, 158
Matthew (S.), Gospel of; peculiarities of language in, 90 sq., 112; its relation to the Gospel of the Hebrews, 213
measure, in what sense used, 167, 169
metaphors obscured, 142 sq.
Milman (Dean), error of, 227
modius, 168
Mount, Sermon on the; its locality, 110 sq.
Münster's Latin Bible, 149
μέριμνα, μεριμνᾶν, 171 sq., 204; distinguished from *μέλειν*, 172
μετάνοια, μεταμέλεια, 76
μετρητής, 168
μοιχᾶσθαι, μοιχευθῆναι, 70 sq.
μορφή, σχῆμα, 77 sq.

Nicene Creed, misunderstanding of, 122 sq.
Nicolas of Lyra, 226
νήπιοι, παιδία, 73
νόμος, ὁ νόμος, 99

official titles, rendering of, 162 sq.
Origen, on *ἐπιούσιος*, 195 sq., 206 sq.; on *περιούσιος*, 234 sq.; his method of interpretation, 208; general adoption of his interpretations, 209
ὁδός (*ἡ*), 103 sq.
οἶδα, γινώσκω, ἐπίσταμαι, etc., 60 sq.
ὄνομα (*τό*), 106 sq.
ὀπτάνεσθαι, 144
ὀργή (*ἡ*), 105 sq.
ὄρος (*τό*), 110 sq.
-ούσιος, adjectives in; derived from *-ων*, 200, 239; from *οὐσία*, 201
οὕτως, 73

Papias, 28, 186
paronomasia, 58 sq.
Paul (S.); his use of the aorist, 84 sq.; his vision, 89 sq.; his teaching of redemption, 98; his conception of law, 99; his thorn in the flesh, 143
peculium, peculiaris, 240 sq.
peculiar, 241 sq.
perfect, confused with the aorist, 82; misrendered, 88 sq.
Peshito; see *Syriac Versions*
Pfeiffer, 222
Phenice, Phœnix, Phœnicia, 162
pleroma, the, 102 sq.
prepositions; in composition neglected, 68 sq.; variation of, disregarded, 69; mistranslations of, 118 sq.
present tense, mistranslated, 93 sq.
Plumptre (Prof.) on revision, 18, 189
proper names; how to be dealt with, 147 sq.; should conform in the O. T. and N. T., 151 sq.; whether to be translated or reproduced, 161 sq.
παῖς, servant, 141
παράκλητος, 50 sq.
πάρεσις, 135 sq.
περιουσιασμός, 236
περιούσιος, 196. 206, 234 sq.
περιποίησις, 236 sq.
πλοῖον, τὸ πλοῖον, 112 sq.
πνεῦμα, wind, spirit, 57 sq.

Digitized by Google

πολλοί, οἱ πολλοί, etc., 98 sq.
πρᾶγμα (τὸ), 107 sq.
προβιβάζειν, 136
προφήτης (ὁ), 102
πυλῶνες, 104
πτερύγιον (τὸ), 109
πωροῦν, πώρωσις, 136
φαίνειν, φαίνεσθαι, 129 sq.
φαίνομαι ὤν, φαίνομαι εἶναι, 130
φθινόπωρινός, 135
φωνή, φθόγγος, 74

Rabbi, Rabboni, 162
Rahab, spelling of, 155
redemption, 98
Revision (the new) of the English Bible; historical parallel to, 12 sq.; gloomy forebodings of, 13; exaggerated views of, 13; antagonism to, 14; disastrous results anticipated from, 15; ultimate acceptance of, 16 sq.; need of, 17 sq. (*passim*); prospects of, 187 sq.; conservative tendencies of rules affecting, 191 sq.; liberal conditions of, 192; favourable circumstances attending, 193 sq.
Roberts (Dr), 214
Rome, bishops of; their use of the Latin Versions, 8 sq.
Rufinus, 3

salvation, how regarded in the N. T., 94
Saron: see *Sharon*
second Advent, 104 sq.
shamefaced, shamefast, 185
Sharon, the, 108 sq., 154
Shechinah, σκηνή, 56 sq.
shibboleth, 154
sower, parable of the, 48
Stanley (Dean), 110 sq.
stater, 168
substantia, 220
Suicer, 206
supersubstantialis, 208, 221, 223 sq., 226 sq.
Symmachus, 240
synonymes, 60, 71 sq.
Syrian service-books, 218
Syrian Versions:
  Curetonian; rendering of παράκλητος, 54; of ἐπιούσιος, 214, 217, 218, 232
  Jerusalem; rendering of ἐπιούσιος, 226
  Peshito; rendering of παράκλητος, 54; of Καναναῖος and Χαναναῖος, 139; of ἐπιούσιος, 215, 218, 232
  Philoxenian (Harclean); rendering of σπιλάδες, 137; of ἐπιούσιος, 215 sq.
σάββατα, 146
σάτον, 169
σεβόμενοι, 145
σκηνή, σκηνοῦν, 56 sq.
σπεκουλάτωρ, 165
σπῖλοι, σπιλάδες, 137
στερέωμα, 142 sq.
συλαγωγεῖν, 136
σωζόμενοι (οἱ), 94 sq.
סנלה, 236 sq.

talent, 168
tenses wrongly rendered, 80 sq.
Tertullian, 220
text, importance of a correct, 23 sq.
textual criticism, its tendencies, 19 sq.
Teutonic Versions of the Lord's Prayer, 231
Theodoret on ἐπιούσιος, 212

Digitized by Google

Theophylact on ἐπιούσιος, 212 sq.
Tholuck, 197, 206
Thomas, Acts of, 217
Trench (Abp.) on the Authorized Version, 18, 41, 50, 72, 86, 135, 139, 141, 152, 172, 174, 189
Trent, Council of, 16, 230
Tyndale's Bible: see *Bible*
θεῖον (τὸ), 145
θέλημα, 106 sq.
θριαμβεύειν, 135

Urbane, 156
ὕλη, 160
ὑπό, διά, 119 sq.

various readings, 27 sq.
Victorinus, on ἐπιούσιος, 221; on περιούσιος, 235
Vulgate; see *Jerome* (*S.*)

wages of labourers, 166 sq.
way, the, 103 sq.
Westcott (Dr), 11 sq., 113
Witnesses, the Three Heavenly, 24 sq.
wrath, the, 105 sq.
Wright (Prof.), 215, 217, 218
Wycliffe's Bible: see *Bible*

Zurich Latin Bible, 26, 231
ζῷα, θηρία, 72

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A. AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

DUE SEP 13 1940

JAN 1 7 '62

Digitized by Google